

The Historical Outlook

A JOURNAL FOR

READERS, STUDENTS AND TEACHERS OF HISTORY

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

EDITED IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A
COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, MANAGING EDITOR

Volume X.
Number 8.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1919.

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The German Press and the War, by Dr. V. S. Clark	-	-	425
China Since 1914, by Prof. K. S. Latourette	-	-	428
Serbia in the Great War, by A. M. Gale	-	-	432
Anglo-American Diplomatic Relations, by C. H. Levermore	-		436
Letter from the Committee on Teaching History, by Prof. J. Schafer	-	-	448
A Course in World History, by Prof. C. O. Davis	-	-	451
Helping the Elementary History Teacher, by Dr. C. A. Coulomb,			455
Supplement — A Source Study for College Classes, by Prof. H. E. Bourne	-	-	465

Notes from Historical Field, 447; Periodical Literature, by Dr. G. B. Richards, 447;
Book Reviews, 460; Recent Historical Publications, listed by Dr. C. A. Coulomb, 462;
Current Periodical Articles, listed by L. F. Stock, 463.

Published monthly, except July, August and September, by McKinley Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyrighted, 1919, McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, October 26, 1909, at Post-office at Phila., Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

*The Book that Makes Americans***Turkington's My Country**

Written from the pupil's point of view and translated into the terms of his own everyday experience. That it is just the book needed now is testified by its wide use in schools throughout the country. While furnishing all the necessary material for a formal study of government, the emphasis is on the underlying principles and ideals of American democracy. An excellent text for Americanization courses.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston
New York
Chicago
London



Atlanta
Dallas
Columbus
San Francisco

McCarthy's History of the United States**FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS**

By CHARLES H. MCCARTHY, Ph.D., Knights of Columbus
Professor of American History, the Catholic University of America.

*The Most Important Textbook
Issued for Catholic Schools in Several Years*

Pays due attention to the part played by Catholics in the exploration and development of the country. Treats the beginnings of the Catholic church in the United States.

Written by a distinguished author whose experience has made him familiar with the needs of children in the higher grades of parochial schools.

Attractively illustrated in black and white and color.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago
Boston Atlanta

Effective History Maps

that really enable you to get
the maximum results in
history teaching and study—

No question about it—you want maps of that character. Then you will not delay to inquire about the Johnston-Nystrom Series mentioned below:

AMERICAN HISTORY

By PROF. A. H. SANFORD, State Normal School, La Crosse, Wisconsin. 66 maps on 32 large plates, each 38x48 in.

EUROPEAN HISTORY—Mediaeval and Modern

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of 25 wall maps, size 40x30 in. Includes a new map, showing racial distribution in Europe.

ANCIENT HISTORY

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of six extra large maps, size 52x44 in.

ENGLISH HISTORY

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of 10 wall maps, size 30x40 in.

Get full particulars to-day. Clip this ad—checking the series of maps in which you are interested.

A. J. NYSTROM & CO.

2249-53 Calumet Avenue

Chicago, Ill.

Three Chapters on the World War

**Democracy on Trial in the World War
The Turning of the Tide
Democracy's Victory and Its Meaning**

are contained in our new History, just published,

OUR UNITED STATES

By WILLIAM B. GUITTEAU, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools, Toledo, Ohio

The military preparations of the United States, the brilliant part taken by our Navy, and the heroic fighting of the American troops in France, are told in such a way as to make every child proud of his country.

The book concludes with the draft of the League of Nations; the Peace of Versailles; the return of our soldiers, and the efforts of the Government to rehabilitate and return them to civil life.

Also published in two volumes. Order the Second Volume at once and let your eighth grade pupils have the benefit of these war chapters

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO SAN FRANCISCO

Special Offer

TO

New Subscribers

TO

The Historical Outlook**\$2.80 worth for \$2.00**

To every new subscriber, who sends a full year's subscription of Two Dollars, direct to the publishers, during the month of November, 1919, there will be mailed, *free of charge*, a copy of McKinley's "Collected Materials for the Study of the Great War," selling for 80 cents a copy.

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

TRIAL**SUBSCRIPTIONS**

TO

The Historical Outlook

During the month of November, 1919,
three months' trial subscriptions to

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK

will be accepted at the rate of 60 cents each.

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

A series of articles by trained historical experts upon various phases of war activities will appear in

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK DURING 1919-1920

Among the articles already arranged for are the following:

The Work of the Committee on Public Information During the War. By PROF. GUY STANTON FORD, Professor of History in the University of Minnesota, and formerly chief of the Division of Education and Civic Cooperation of the Committee on Public Information.

The German Press and the War. By DR. VICTOR S. CLARK, in charge of examination of the enemy press for the National Board for Historical Service.

The First Division's First Winter in Europe. By RICHARD A. NEWHALL, Instructor in History in Yale University, Second Lieutenant in the Twenty-eighth United States Infantry, A. E. F., serving with the First Division from October, 1917, until May, 1918, and severely wounded at Cantigny on May 28, 1918.

The Administration of Military Justice During the War. By JESSE S. REEVES, Professor of Political Science in the University of Michigan, Major in U. S. A., and Judge Advocate of the Twentieth Division.

Morale Work in an Army Camp. By RALPH V. D. MAGOFFIN, Professor of History in Johns Hopkins University, and Major in U. S. A., Q. M. C.

The Administration of Army Cantonments and Camps. By the same.

The Procurement and Purchase of Supplies for the Army. By ALBERT L. SCOTT, formerly of the Council of National Defense.

The Organization and Instruction in Aeronautics and Flying. By HIRAM BINGHAM, Professor of History in Yale University and Lieut.-Colonel in the Aviation Service, lately Commander of the United States Flying School at Issoudon.

Experiences of a Y. M. C. A. Man in Russian Siberia. By THOMAS P. MARTIN, Secretary of the Harvard Commission on Western History.

The Work of an Intelligence Officer at First Army Headquarters, A. E. F. By JOHN C. PARRISH, formerly Captain in the U. S. A.

Bolshevism and Radical Socialism

are based upon the ground that civilization has made so little progress that it deserves to be destroyed. Moderate socialists wish existing institutions overturned by votes instead of by violence, but they proclaim the failure of society quite as loudly.

Is modern society a failure? Have we made no progress? Ashley's MODERN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION shows the high school pupil that English-speaking peoples have been increasingly watchful of the liberties of the individual, both political and economic:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Page</i>
1788	First child labor law	262 & 435
1802	Factory reforms	436
1819	Factory reforms	436
1825	Labor unions legalized	263
1832	Parliamentary reforms	429
1832	Emancipation of negro slaves in Great Britain	430
1828	"Catholic Emancipation"	433
1836	Greater freedom of the press	434
1867	Extension of the suffrage	445
1872	The Australian ballot	446
1884	Extension of the suffrage	446
1918	Extension of the suffrage	453
1918	Woman suffrage granted	453
1906	Laws protecting labor unions	653
1909	Minimum wage laws	656
1909	Income and inheritance taxes	451
1911	Unemployment insurance	664
....	Sickness insurance	662
....	Old age pensions	663

Give your students faith in the success of free men in self-government by an historical appreciation of the advances of the past century and a half. Cultivate in them an attitude of sane optimism with reference to our basic political institutions. Ashley's EARLY and MODERN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION are in no sense propaganda; but they offer the best safeguard *against* propaganda—confidence in the fundamental soundness of the social system under which we live.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK
DALLAS

BOSTON
ATLANTA

CHICAGO
SAN FRANCISCO

The Historical Outlook

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

Volume X.
Number 8.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1919.

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

The German Press and the War¹

BY VICTOR S. CLARK, PH.D., RECENTLY OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE.

Shortly after the National Board for Historical Service was organized, and while it was still casting about for new fields of activity, its representatives conferred with members of the Allied missions in America for the purpose of learning what educational and propaganda work similar Entente agencies had conducted in their own countries. As an outcome of these conferences, and through the courtesy of certain foreign offices, the Board was furnished with current files of the leading newspapers and periodicals of Germany and Austria-Hungary to be used for such purposes as it might deem wise and proper. Ultimately, at the personal request of President Wilson, the Carnegie Institution of Washington provided a suite of offices and a clerical staff, which was placed under my direction, for the purpose of making summaries and translations from these papers for the use of the government and of learned societies and other organizations wishing to employ such information in patriotic work. These offices were opened in January, 1918, and soon found abundant demand for the materials they supplied.

Shortly afterwards the Committee on Public Information established a somewhat similar service, more particularly for furnishing copy to the press, and in the interest of economy the two offices were combined to the extent of conducting this work of both organizations in the same place and under the same general direction. This co-operation continued until the armistice, when the Committee on Public Information service ceased, and its newspaper collection was turned over to the Library of Congress.

Meantime the sources through which newspapers and periodicals were received were constantly extended, so that we eventually acquired fairly complete files of more than thirty German and Austrian daily papers and of nearly twenty weekly and monthly publications, as well as a number of books published in Germany during the war.

Original copies of all the summaries and translations made have been indexed under general headings and preserved as part of the office records. In this way more than 20,000 typewritten cards of half-letter-sheet size have been accumulated. These cards present a fairly complete history of newspaper

discussion, public opinion, economic conditions, and legislation in the Central Powers during 1918 and the first half of 1919—the period when the American troops were a real factor in the war and the revolutionary era. Through the Library of Congress, photostat sets of these cards are being made and sold at cost to other libraries.

Permission to consult these files and records was extended to representatives of government departments and properly accredited investigators outside the public service. The newspapers, especially, were almost constantly in use by such investigators. From them were prepared the first official texts of the important treaties made by Germany during the war. Some of the pamphlets issued for informational and propaganda purposes by private endowments and societies were based partly on texts from the same sources. Occasionally translations of articles of timely interest and importance were given to American newspapers and magazines for publication.

Ordinarily the newspapers arrived about three weeks after their date of issue, and fortunately no consignments were lost in crossing the Atlantic.

Naturally printed materials gave us no direct military intelligence of value, because they afforded only such information as the military authorities of Germany and Austria were willing to have reach neutral and enemy countries. Germany pursued a liberal policy in permitting the publication at home of the official army reports of its enemies, as well as those of its own general staff. Expert discussion of these reports by military correspondents, and descriptive letters and reminiscences of recent battles and campaigns, which appeared after the information they conveyed had ceased to be of value to Germany's opponents, were of historical rather than military interest.

At first it was thought that items describing economic conditions in the Central Powers would have more practical worth than the other information obtainable from printed enemy sources. A close study and comparison of the miscellaneous material thus afforded—for very few collected statistics were published in the Central Powers during the war—did, indeed, enable one to gain a general impression of the situation in regard to food, raw materials, transportation, and private and public finance. But it soon became evident that the value of the press as a mir-

¹ This article was written in June, 1919, and refers to newspapers published up to the end of May.

ror of public sentiment and morale outweighed its value in other respects. Perhaps no single feature of the war was more clearly revealed than the far-reaching social demoralization that it produced, which increased in something like a geometrical ratio with the protraction of hostilities. The disposition to evade government regulations, contempt for law, increase of crime and especially of murders and other deeds of violence, the presence of great numbers of deserters in cities and even in country districts, the breakdown of administrative machinery—all these things were disclosed with increasing frequency and vividness as the war went on.

The press of Germany and Austria-Hungary also reflected political sentiment and testified to the bitter conflict of opinion in those countries regarding a host of questions directly and indirectly associated with war policies. The tension between social classes that ultimately manifested itself in the revolution grew increasingly apparent, so that events which came as a surprise to many Americans appeared but a logical and anticipated outcome to persons familiar with the newspaper discussion that preceded them.

German and Austrian newspaper readers were kept well informed by special correspondents and occasional writers regarding political, economic and social conditions in the Balkans, Turkey, and the occupied territories. After the conclusion of peace between the Central Empires and Russia, in March, 1917, the German press contained many authoritative and informing articles upon Russian conditions. These were written by commercial attaches, business men, and political correspondents who had resided for years in Russia, some of whom were natives of that country. Later these accounts were supplemented by the narratives of war prisoners and refugees. Such articles not only kept us in touch with German policies in Eastern Europe, but contained illuminating accounts of Russian programs and policies, and of social and economic conditions in that country. The fact that the writers frequently represented different schools of political thought did not detract in the least from the value of their observations; for controversy often inspired them to plain speaking and important admissions.

During the period of the armistice German papers have afforded us many entertaining and significant accounts of the experiences and the attitude of mind of the residents in the occupied territories and Alsace-Lorraine toward the Allied authorities, and especially toward the American troops. Snatches of conversations with common soldiers and of more formal interviews with our army officers throw interesting sidelights on what will always remain an interesting episode in American history. During this period the papers present a minute record of the progress of Bolshevik agitation and the development of Socialist theories and programs not only in Germany and Austria, but throughout all Eastern and Central Europe. They also contain quotations from the press of neutral and other continental powers that otherwise might not come to the knowledge and attention

of American readers. The German interpretation of the peace conference, as presented in the press, will retain historical value, if not for its objective accuracy, at least as a record of local sentiment and opinion during a period of great historical importance. The press also abounds with character studies of men prominent in European public life during the war.

All viewpoints are represented in these newspaper discussions. During the Communist regime in Munich and in Budapest we have recorded the edicts, ordinances and appeals of the Spartacan and Bolshevik authorities. Quantities of propaganda material appear in the "Communized" newspapers during this period. Naturally the official and semi-official press reports the debates and proceedings of the national assemblies of Germany and Austria and of the federal states, and contains editorial comment upon every measure of importance that has been presented to those bodies during the epoch of political reconstruction.

Interesting also has been the historical material published with the intent of justifying Germany for beginning hostilities, and for its subsequent conduct of the war. These efforts at justification are inspired by domestic party considerations, as much as by a desire to clear Germany's good name abroad; for the political capital of the Socialists has been derived in no small part from the blunders and crimes of their opponents, and some of the most effective criticism of Germany's war policies has always come from within the bosom of the country. Since the armistice, men prominent both in civil and in military life during the period of royal government have hastened to present their exculpations to the public. The book columns of the daily press and of political and literary periodicals have been filled with reviews of such memoirs and quasi-historical monographs.

The censorship maintained during the war was abolished at the time of the revolution, and since the armistice the newspapers of the Central Powers have been freer from direct and indirect official control than those of our own country or of the Allies. An interesting and authoritative account of the German censorship was published in Munich immediately after the overthrow of the royal authorities. Its title, translated literally, is, "How we were lied to." However, the reviews of the book indicate that no matter how detailed the regulations and how strict the enforcement of the rules imposed by the censor, they were—like all other laws and ordinances in Germany during the war—honored widely by nonobservance. Although there was a rule forbidding the public discussion of the censorship, it was bitterly attacked in the Reichstag on many occasions with a great wealth of citations of concrete instances and material, and these Reichstag debates were published in the newspapers with extensive and trenchant editorial comment. Journals were occasionally suppressed for short periods, as they are to-day by the Allied authorities in the occupied territories of Germany. They frequently appeared with white spots, where articles or portions of articles, and sometimes entire

pages, had been deleted just before the paper went to press. But not infrequently the very articles thus carefully suppressed appeared in another paper almost simultaneously, either in the same city or in some provincial town, and occasionally an article forbidden on one day found its way into the columns of the paper for which it was originally prepared a week or two later. In other words, the censorship was by no means an infallible agency for throttling public discussion—at least, during the last years of the war. It has proven equally ineffective in the Entente countries; for the methods of evasion are legion. For instance, a few weeks ago the leading Italian Socialist newspaper, *Avanti*, appeared with a blank column headed "Special Correspondence from Berlin," followed by the official "Suppressed by the Censor," but elsewhere in the paper was printed the substance of the Berlin correspondent's communication, though ostensibly derived from other sources. It is, of course, impossible to venture a positive assertion at such long range as from Washington to Berlin, but a comparison of the American press and the German press during the period that we were engaged in the war leaves an impression that the voluntary co-operation of the newspaper publishers of America resulted in a more effective standardization of the information and arguments presented to the American people, than existed under the nominally strict military control exercised in Germany.

During the war and the revolution, the leading newspapers continued their usual commercial and market service, and the New York quotations of American securities, received by telegraph via neutral countries, were regularly published. During 1917 and 1918 a period of enormous credit expansion and promotion activity occurred in Germany and Austria-Hungary. Consequently financial columns were filled with accounts of amalgamations, increases of capital, high dividends and stock exchange booms. Of course, the armistice abruptly terminated this fallacious prosperity.

Meantime the advertising columns of the metropolitan dailies continue to picture the thousandfold features of modern business and social life. Theaters and concerts, cabarets and afternoon teas at fashionable restaurants, races and athletic tournaments, public meetings and assemblies, art exhibitions and industrial fairs, crowd the entertainment columns with their announcements. The great department stores advertise the latest fashions. Silk goods and articles of substitute fabrics are perhaps most frequently quoted. Simultaneously with the lifting of the embargo against Austria, an American export house inserted display advertisements in the Vienna papers. Even before that our popular magazines and some of our technical periodicals were advertised for sale by Austrian book dealers. Although the war may have depressed the publishing business in Germany, a multitude of technical and literary works, including some luxurious new editions, continue to appear. The Leipzig Fair, held late in April, 1919, is advertised as having 2,000 more exhibits than at any

previous period, either in war or peace, and as being well attended by foreign buyers. Among the advertisements since the armistice is one announcing regular air service from Berlin to Leipzig, Weimar, Hamburg and the Lower Rhine, for passengers and parcels, with immediate automobile connections from the terminals to adjacent points. During the war daily mail service by air was maintained between Vienna, Cracow, Lemberg and Kieff.

Since the overthrow of the royal governments many newspapers have been founded in Germany. Most of these represent radical Socialism, and some of them have been very ephemeral—hardly continuing beyond the second or the third issue. However, by no means all the revolutionary publications have been of this character. The Berlin *Freiheit*, representing the Independent Socialists, and *Die Rote Fahne*, of the same city, representing the Communists or Bolsheviks, have become important organs of public opinion. Accompanying them are a number of provincial weeklies and dailies representing the same schools of thought and often bearing the same name as their metropolitan contemporaries.

This dispersion of newspaper activity since the revolution presents a decided contrast to the centripetal tendency observable in the German press prior to that event. During the period of industrial and banking amalgamation there was a tendency to concentrate control of the great metropolitan newspapers in the hands of narrow groups of capitalists. While the censorship has ceased, complete freedom of the press has not existed continuously, because newspapers have been seized by force by the Communists, when they have secured temporary control of a city, and have been edited in the interests of that party. On the other hand, the government has suppressed radical publications temporarily as a measure of public security during periods of revolt and agitation. During the Spartacan uprisings in Berlin last December, January and March, the insurgents seized and established some of their principal strongholds in the printing establishments of the Berlin dailies.

Throughout the last year of the war, the main topic of newspaper discussion was peace. Germans were divided into two schools of thought upon the subject. One school believed that Germany could be saved only by "a peace of force" or a "dictated peace"—indeed, such a peace as the Allies have now imposed upon Germany. The other school believed that the war would be in vain—even as a tragedy along the route of progress—unless it was concluded by "a peace of understanding" or "a peace of conciliation." By this was meant a peace that both belligerents voluntarily accepted as just. Of course, it would be immensely difficult to agree upon a formula for a peace of the second kind. President Wilson's public utterances, both before America's entry into the war and subsequently, were widely published and discussed in connection with this topic, and his views became better known to the Germans than those of any other public man among their enemies. Gradually—and this is true of a period considerably pre-

ceding Germany's military collapse—the program of those people in the Central Powers who honestly desired a peace of understanding, and who believed that only such a peace afforded even qualified security against the recurrence of future wars, crystallized into a categorical endorsement of President Wilson's fourteen points. Consequently when Germany was at last forced to appeal for an armistice, it was perfectly logical from the standpoint of previous public discussion in that country for the government to stipulate that President Wilson's peace program should constitute the basis of the coming settlement.

With the occurrence of the revolution, the dominant interest in Germany changed for a time from the question of peace to the character and permanence of the new government. Indeed, Germany's relations with the Allies, in spite of an undercurrent of treaty talk and of protest against the successive armistice conditions, seemed almost forgotten in the midst of more immediate and acute domestic controversies. The papers were filled with accounts of Spartacan outbreaks and the overturn of cabinets, and with theoretical articles upon socialization, the relation of labor to the new state, the financial and economic problems of reconstruction, and a thousand and one similar matters relating mainly or exclusively to Germany alone.

With the presentation of the peace terms at Versailles, a third epoch in German press discussion began. In a way the old controversy between the champions of a peace of force and a peace of understanding was revived; because the former regarded the Allies' peace terms as a confirmation of their theory, and, desperate as was Germany's condition, they would have appealed to force to resist force. Moreover, they were encouraged to renew the whole polemic as to the justice of Germany's policy at the outbreak of the war. The Socialist and Liberals likewise found these terms of unanticipated severity, and were disillusioned in respect to the hope they honestly cherished that President Wilson's principles would find full acceptance. At the present writing (June, 1919) the newspapers of the Central Powers are completely dominated by this topic. And yet one feels that peace having been finally accepted, its terms, like other matters relating immediately to the war, will speedily fall back to a place of secondary interest. For the great question in Germany, the question that touches most intimately both the life of the individual and the problem of Germany's future place in European civilization, is the problem of reconstruction in accordance with the Socialist principles endorsed by a controlling element of the new government.

China Since 1914: A Summary¹

BY KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, DENISON UNIVERSITY.

When in August, 1914, the war burst upon the world China was ill-prepared to meet it. She was only beginning to find herself after the revolution which had made her a republic and needed all the advantages which peace could offer to enable her to establish a unified and stable government. In her president, Yuan Shih K'ai, she had a strong man, but he had aroused the opposition of much of the country by dispensing with Parliament and by other high-handed measures and his rule was a thinly veiled military despotism. Financial reorganization, a better educational system, a more effective control of the provinces by the Central Government, more railway construction, a permanent written constitution suited to China's needs, and freedom from the intrigues of foreign powers were all imperative necessities. With the nation in so critical a condition it was to be expected that a world war would affect it profoundly, even though it was to have but little active part in the actual hostilities.

¹ For more detailed information see Wheeler, "China and the World War," Macmillan, 1919; Hornbeck, "Contemporary Politics in the Far East," Appleton, 1916; Latourette, "The Development of China," Houghton, Mifflin, 1917; Treat, "Japan, America and the Great War" (World Peace Foundation, 1919); and Latourette, "China, the United States and the War" (World Peace Foundation, 1919).

China first seriously felt the effects of the war when in August Japan demanded that Germany withdraw from Kiao Chau, and when, on the failure of the Teutons to comply, she attacked them and drove them out of their Shantung possessions. Her scant respect for China's neutrality during these operations and her cavalier treatment of the civilian population boded ill for friendly relations between the two great peoples of the Far East. Early in 1915 Japan presented to Yuan Shih K'ai her now famous twenty-one demands, arranged in five groups. These in brief were (1) that China should agree to any disposition that Japan and Germany might make of the latter's holdings in Shantung, that China should alienate no further portion of Shantung to any third power, that she should give her consent to Japan's building an additional railway in the province, and that she should open new ports; (2) that China should grant to the Japanese certain special privileges in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, particularly the extension of the terms of the leases on the railways and ports held there by the island empire, the right of freedom of travel, residence, and the renting and owning of land outside the leased territories—liberties which involved the further extension of Japanese police and extraterritorial jurisdiction in these sections—further railway and mining concessions, the right to veto any railway grants or any loans made on

the security of the revenues of these sections, and the right to be consulted in the appointment of foreign advisers in these districts; (3) a provision that the Han-yeh-ping Company—the largest Chinese steel and iron concern and located at Hanyang in the heart of the Eighteen Provinces—should in time become a joint Chinese and Japanese enterprise, and that no rights in it should be alienated and no further mines in the neighborhood of its holdings should be worked without the consent of Tokyo; (4) that the Chinese should not alienate to a third power any further sections of her seacoast; and (5) that China should grant to the Japanese certain railway concessions in the Yangtze Valley and Chehkiang, and partial control over her police, that she should buy from them a definite proportion of her munitions, that she should employ Japanese as advisers, and that she should permit their churches, hospitals, and schools to own land outside the treaty ports. When these demands, which were at first kept secret and were then published by Tokyo in an emasculated form, became known in their entirety, a cry of indignation burst from all China. Their land, the Chinese believed, was being delivered into the hands of their doughty neighbors. In spite of protests, however, the first four of the groups had to be conceded. Europe was too busy with her own affairs to interfere as she would have done in normal times. It is doubtful, indeed, whether Japan's allies dared run the risk of losing her support by crossing her, and Germany, naturally, would probably have made almost any concession to have separated her from the Entente. The United States, the one great neutral power, contented herself with a formal statement to Peking that she could not recognize any agreement which would impair the rights of her citizens, China's political or territorial integrity, or the open door.

Unjust and unwise as most of these demands seem to Americans, we must not condemn them without first taking into account Japan's position. Her very existence depends upon her keeping open in China the door to her commerce, and this had been repeatedly put in jeopardy by the Occident which, while closing to Japan many outlets in other quarters of the globe, had threatened to exclude her from this her most natural market and source of raw materials. It was not at all strange that in her anxiety to take advantage of Europe's preoccupation to make secure her advantages, she should employ drastic measures and overreach herself. She was, moreover, but using the type of diplomacy which she had seen the Occident practice in the nineteenth century, both in China and elsewhere. In this course she was strengthened by the confidence which her military successes of the past twenty years had roused in the hearts of her populace, and by a contempt which many of her people had acquired for the seeming political incompetency of the Chinese.

For a time Japan appeared to be content with the gains made by obtaining the first four of the five groups of demands, although the Chinese believed that her agents were constantly intriguing to extend

her power and lived in mingled terror, anger and hate of the islanders. In 1916 she strengthened her position by an agreement with Russia by which the quondam enemies agreed not to enter into alliances against each other, and to consult in case the interests of either were threatened. In 1916 also an unfortunate affair at Cheng Chia Tun in Eastern Inner Mongolia led to further demands of Tokyo upon Peking, but these were pressed in a much more conciliatory spirit than were those of 1915, and the final arrangement was not as humiliating to China as had at first seemed probable. In February and March, 1917, just before the United States entered the war, and when the Allies were hard pressed, Japan concluded secret agreements with Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy by which these four powers agreed to support at the peace conference her demands for the surrender to her of the former German possessions in China and in the Pacific north of the equator. She thereby strengthened the position which she had acquired in the first of the four groups of demands. After the United States entered the war it became advisable for Washington and Tokyo to have some formal understanding about China. This was especially urgent in view of the fact that when in the spring of 1917 the United States had advised China that it was more important to the peace of the world that she preserve harmony within her own borders than that she should join in the world war, the Japanese government had apparently protested that all notes vitally concerning China should go through her hands. Accordingly, there was concluded in November, 1917, the Lansing-Ishii Agreement by which the United States recognized "that territorial propinquity creates special relations between countries, . . . (and) that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in that part to which her possessions are contiguous," and by which both powers declared themselves opposed to the acquisition of any special rights or privileges that would affect the independence or territorial integrity of China or that would deny to the subjects or citizens of any country the full enjoyment of "equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China." Interest in this agreement has chiefly centered itself around the meaning of the words "special interests." By these Americans have believed that nothing more was intended than the natural commercial and diplomatic relations which exist between any two mutually independent powers which adjoin each other, as, for instance, England and France, and pointed to the renewed guarantee of China's independence and the open door. That this is the meaning which Mr. Lansing believed the phrase to hold is made increasingly probable by his recent assertion before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs that at the time when the agreement was drawn he knew nothing of Japan's arrangements of February, 1917, with her allies. Many Japanese, on the other hand, have asserted and have tried to convince the Chinese that by this phrase America has recognized all the encroachments on their sovereignty which Japan has made since the outbreak of the war.

The agreement had the effect upon many of the Chinese of making them feel that their best friend, the United States, had deserted them.

While these diplomatic events were taking place, China's internal affairs were going from bad to worse. In the fall and winter of 1915, Yuan Shih K'ai had attempted to overthrow the republic and make himself emperor. This had aroused such protests throughout China that in March, 1916, he announced that the republic would be maintained. This repentance came too late, for Yuan's enemies declared him still to be a traitor and demanded his resignation. From this last humiliation he was saved by his death in June, 1916. For a time the country breathed easily. Li Yuan Hung, the vice-president, became president, and the parliament reassembled which Yuan had in 1913 first thinned and then dissolved. Li seemed to be an honest and well-meaning executive, parliament set itself to the task of drafting a permanent constitution, and for a time it looked as though internal peace had really come to the unhappy land. Had there been no war or could China have been left alone, she might at this time have worked out her salvation. When, however, in February, 1917, the United States severed relations with Germany, she sent notes to the several neutral countries asking them to do likewise. So far in the war, China's sympathies had been, if anywhere, with the Central Powers. This was partly because of German propaganda, partly because of the admiration of the military leaders for the Teutonic system, but chiefly because of the feeling against Japan, who was one of the Allies. There was in China, however, unbounded admiration for the United States, for she had been the originator and champion of the open door, she had never sought territorial concessions in China, she had on most occasions been just and even generous with China, and American missionaries by their unselfish services, particularly in their schools and hospitals, had made a favorable impression on Young China. President Wilson's statements of principles, moreover, appealed to many of the Chinese and seemed to promise their freedom from foreign aggression. Adroitly applied pressure, therefore, succeeded in March, 1917, in causing Peking to sever diplomatic relations with Germany. The next step, that of declaring war, was not, however, so quickly or so easily taken. The leaders of the nation were fairly well agreed that the war should be entered, but divisions at Peking nearly wrecked both the project and the government. Parliament was controlled by a democratic group whose stronghold was in the South, while the cabinet and the premier were of a military group which was strongest in the North. The cabinet decided in favor of war, and presented to Parliament a bill to that effect. Parliament might have passed this, but a mob said to have been roused by the military chiefs tried to intimidate the legislature into speedy action, and that body, sensitive of its prerogatives, postponed consideration of the measure and demanded the removal of the premier, Tuan Chi Jui. On May 23 President Li yielded and dismissed Tuan. Upon this the military chiefs called

for the restoration of the latter, and the dissolution of parliament and threatened the secession of their provinces. Had President Li been firm all might yet have been well, but he called upon Chang Hsun, one of the military leaders, to come to Peking to help adjust the difficulties, and at his advice complied with the desires of the military party and dismissed parliament, an act which violated the constitution. Chang Hsun was for the moment the most powerful person in Peking, and on July 1 he astonished the world by declaring the Manchu empire restored. To this bizarre scheme neither the military chiefs nor the Southern party would listen, and the former united in defeating Chang Hsun and forcing the puppet emperor once more into retirement. Li Yuan Hung had resigned when Chang Hsun executed his coup d'etat. When the republic was restored he declined to resume office, the vice-president, Feng Kuo Chang, became president, and Tuan was once more appointed premier. The parliamentary leaders refused to be reconciled to their northern rivals, and, retiring to Canton, waged civil war for the control of the country. Fighting has continued intermittently to the present time. It has badly disorganized some of China's richest provinces, wasted funds which were badly needed for other purposes, and far from being conclusive has increasingly deteriorated into a kind of guerrilla warfare between rival army chieftains. The election in 1918 of Hsu Shih Chang, a northern military leader, as president, did not help matters. The military group was, however, in control of Peking, and on August 14, 1917, the country under its leadership declared war on the Central Powers.

China gained a few things by her entry into the world struggle. She could, of course, cancel her portion of the Boxer indemnity to the Teutonic Powers, and she obtained the postponement of her payments of the indemnity to the Allies. The Allies, too, took steps to permit China to increase her customs duties to an effective five per cent., a much-needed financial measure, and one which seems (September, 1919) about to be consummated. Peking expected also to obtain representation at the peace conference, and so to be able to present directly the nation's case against Japan. Young China vainly hoped that the Allies might even agree to the withdrawal of the foreign garrisons from legations in the capital and the Peking-to-Tientsin railway. China could, however, render little effective aid to the Allies. A hundred and forty thousand or more Chinese coolies had been sent, principally from Shantung, to help behind the lines in France, but this had been done under British supervision, and had been begun long before China entered the war. China could have helped to police her northern frontier and Siberia itself, but her leaders proved so venal that funds intended for this purpose were diverted to private ends. So notorious did the conduct of these self-seekers become that the Allies in 1918 lodged a formal complaint at Peking against China's half-hearted co-operation. The Peking authorities were, moreover, widely accused by their countrymen of selling the country to Japan in return

for support and financial subsidies. In May, 1918, the two nations did, indeed, enter into an agreement for joint military and naval action in the war, which, while it seemed harmless on its surface, might place the Chinese army under Japanese direction. China, moreover, borrowed money extensively from Japan, which meant the danger of control of China's finances and natural resources. Rumors of secret agreements to China's detriment were persistent, and the few documents that were published, while not as bad as popular report had represented them to be, had to do chiefly with the loaning of money for the building of railways and the administration of the former German holdings in Shantung, and seemed to bode ill for the future power of China in that province.

The armistice and the assembling of the Paris Conference brought new problems to China. The North and the South felt it advisable to compose their difficulties and act as a unit at the conference. To that end peace negotiations were begun, but the success of these proved only partial, and hostilities are still in progress. The delegation that was sent to Paris, however, represented both North and South, and then at least China faced the world with a united front. The body was made up largely of younger foreign-trained men of large ability who presented their country's case with skill and forcefulness. They asked that the former German holdings be returned directly to China, and hoped as well to obtain the cancellation of the concessions given Japan in 1915. These last, they felt, had in effect been extorted by force, were contrary to the spirit of Mr. Wilson's pronouncements, and should be annulled. In China's hopes the liberal sentiment in America and in parts of Europe joined, but they were doomed to bitter disappointment. Great Britain, France and Italy were bound to Japan by their agreements of 1917, and to disavow these might lead to serious questioning of their own wished for territorial gains. President Wilson, China's one hope on the Council, acting against the advice of at least some of his expert advisers, permitted Japan to retain the German holdings on the assurance, apparently somewhat indefinite as to time and details, that these would sometime be returned to China. This section of the peace treaty called for bitter denunciation in America and among many in Europe, for it seemed a sacrifice of the principles which the Allies had avowed and appeared to saddle the League of Nations at its outset with a serious injustice. The settlement, however, may quite possibly prove less unfortunate than at first seemed probable. It may have been the means of retaining Japan in the League, and if Japan will make explicit promises of the time and means for the early and complete restoration of the holdings, as the opinion of the world and her own better judgment may lead her to do, and then keep them, the outcome will probably be far better than if she had been peremptorily deprived by the conference of the captured properties. The effect in China of the peace treaty was to arouse the greatest wave of indignation that the country has experienced. The Paris delegates

refused to affix their signatures to the treaty with Germany, although they expected to gain membership in the League by signing the Austrian documents. In China itself students and the middle class were loud in their protests. Leaders in Peking who were thought to be subservient to Japan were roughly handled and an anti-Japanese boycott has been organized which has seriously crippled Japanese commerce. It is evident that Japan must adopt a far more conciliatory attitude than she has in the past if she is not to have facing her a united China. Tokyo has, indeed, already given assurances of an early restoration of the Shantung properties to China, although the complete details of time and means are still unpublished, and the terms may not be sufficiently complete to satisfy China.

Steps have been taken, however, which look toward an early attempt to substitute international control for special concessions and spheres of influence in China. An International Banking Consortium is being organized which purposes to open its membership to the leading financial interests in America, England, France, Japan, and possibly Russia and other countries. It is planned to assume the monopoly of all loans made to China, and so to make impossible the grant of special concessions to separate countries. Japan's legitimate interests would be safeguarded, as would those of Europe and America. Whatever the fate of the Consortium it seems certain that upon some such plan and upon the organization of international commissions to take over those other interests in China now held by foreign powers must depend the just and safe solution of the Chinese question. China must be helped to the independence and unity of which her people are so fully capable, and at the same time the open door to all the world must be maintained without discrimination. In China the League has one of its largest and most urgent problems.

"Peace with the Germans," by Frank H. Simonds (*Review of Reviews* for August), contains an excellent map of the Danger Spots of the Treaty, and an explanation of the significance of these.

H. N. Brailford protests against the isolation of Germany (*Contemporary Review* for July: "The Eastern Settlement"), saying: "We are creating a corpse big enough to poison Europe."

"Indiana in the Mexican War," a study by R. C. Buley, appears in the first installment of the *Indiana Magazine of History* for September, 1919. The narrative takes up the recruiting of men for the war, life at camp, the trip to Mexico and the early operations of Indiana troops on the border.

"To treat the African as a European is to create a false relationship harmful to both. . . . The talents of the African develop in a different direction from those of the European. . . . The African is a natural Socialist and his tribal system a mode of servile state while the European is an ultra-individualist," says Percival F. Smith in *Little's Living Age* for August 2, 1919, in an article entitled, "The Negro Problem from a British Point of View."

Serbia's Work in the Great War

BY ALLAN MURRAY GALE.

The supreme value of Serbia's work in the great war has been obscured by the stupendous conflict that raged on the Western front, yet it was the often expressed opinion of the late Lord Cromer, perhaps the foremost authority of our day upon the Eastern question and its bearing upon world politics, that Germany and the Central Powers could well afford complete failure in the West, if successful in their drive to the East. It has been said and well said, that the first gun fired across the Danube was in reality aimed not at Belgrade, but at Egypt. And it will very possibly be held by the historian of the future, that Germany's vital mistake lay in wasting her strength in the West instead of driving through with full power to the East, where sure victory, with the certainty of world dominion to follow, seemed well within her grasp. And it is altogether possible, in spite of that mistake, that the peace signed at Versailles must have been a German peace, but for Serbia's heroic defense of the Gateway to the East, until the golden moment for the Central Powers had passed.

It is for these reasons that Serbia's part in the war has an importance that has not been generally recognized.¹

The Archduke Ferdinand, Crown Prince of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and his morganatic wife, were murdered in the streets of Serajevo, the capital of Bosnia, June 28, 1914. Bosnia had been made a ward of the Dual Empire in 1878 by the Powers, for "occupation and administration." False to her trust Austria seized the province by right of might in 1908, and thereafter ruled the people as a conquered and subject people, mercilessly and with a rod of iron. Bosnia had formed no part of any Serbian state since the year 1356, but her people were Serbs, and they looked to free and independent Serbia as the Moses who might some day lead them out from intolerable bondage. It was therefore easy for unscrupulous statesmen in Vienna to draw up an indictment against Serbia, as at least accessory to the murder, which was plausible on the surface.

¹ Official figures reported by the Serbian General Staff to the Peace Conference at Paris:

Serbian army mobilized July, 1914, to October, 1915, 707,343 men, representing 24 per cent. of total and 40 per cent. of male population.

Killed or died of wounds or disease:

1914.....	69,022.
1915.....	56,842.—Up to September.
1915.....	150,000.—During retreat to Adriatic.
1916.....	7,208.
1917.....	2,270.
1918.....	7,000.
1915.....	77,278.—Missing after retreat to sea and undoubtedly dead.

Total..... 369,620

Serbia knew that the indictment could not bear the scrutiny of any impartial court, but exhausted by the strain of the Balkan wars of 1912-13, when Austria refused to submit her case to either the Hague Tribunal or to the Powers for decision, Serbia was still anxious to go to all lengths short of actual dishonor, to satisfy her powerful accuser.

Unfortunately no adjustment of the quarrel could further Austria's determination to be master of the gateway to the East. Already in 1913 she had proposed to Italy an unprovoked conquest of Serbia, and now, secure in the backing of Germany, she was by no means to be balked of her prey. On the night of July 23, in the words of Mr. Davis ("The Roots of the War"), "only forty-eight hours were left to Serbia either to sign away her national independence, or engage in a deadly struggle against hopeless odds," and true to her traditions Serbia accepted the "deadly struggle."

War was declared on July 28, 1914, just one month after the murder of the Crown Prince Ferdinand, and if Austria had launched a prompt and vigorous attack with the troops she then had massed on the frontier, she might have carried all before her. But contemptuous of her small enemy she wasted two weeks in half-hearted attempts to force a passage of the river Save and take Belgrade. Abandoning these futile efforts during the second week in August, the Austrians threw an army of two hundred and fifty thousand men across the rivers Drinka and Save in the northwest corner of Serbia, and advancing on a sixty mile front began a campaign which they fondly expected to be a "mere military promenade" of short duration. Instead, the Serbian forces gathered on the eastern slope of the Cer mountain, fell upon them on the 20th of August, with inconceivable fury, breaking the Austrian center, and in the course of a series of brilliant engagements lasting ten days, cut them to pieces.

A month later in equally overwhelming force the great Dual Empire launched its second invasion, which was again brought to a sudden and bloody end by the indomitable Serbians at Rosen. This campaign lasted a little longer than the campaign of August, but although the Austrians were able to hold the hills of Jagodina and the mountains of Gouchevo, and Serbia short of men and munitions, failed to make good a counter offensive directed against Bosnia, the net result to the invader was substantially the same.

The third and last attempt of Austria unaided, to crush her small but gallant enemy, came at the beginning of November.

Valdislav R. Savieth, himself a participant in these campaigns, says in his "South Eastern Europe": "The Austrian forces at the beginning of November exceeded 320,000 men." And it is to be remembered

that Serbia had entered upon the war already strained and exhausted by her campaigns of 1912-13 against the Turks and Bulgars. Her defeat of Austria in August and in September had drawn heavily upon both her man-power and her slender store of ammunition and military supplies, greatly reducing her power of resistance, and in the face of an attack in such overwhelming force, Serbia's position was critical.

In these circumstances the calm patience and sound strategy of the Serbian High Command was beyond praise. The Serbian forces on the line of the Drinka and Save were drawn back. In the south the troops which had operated in Bosnia also retreated toward Uzica until the Serbians presented a shortened and compact front to the enemy from Oberovac on the north to Uzica on the south. The retreat was conducted practically without loss, over country roads rendered almost impassable by the marching and countermarching of troops and heavy artillery through the summer. The evacuation of Rosen and consequently of Valevo was a necessary part of this withdrawal, although it threw open to the enemy so large a part of Serbia that even strong hearts trembled in fear of the moral effect upon the men in the ranks and upon the people. That fear was groundless; Austria rejoiced, and Vienna was illuminated, but the Serbian soldiery and the Serbian people undauntedly held to their faith in their leaders. From the middle of November for nearly a month the Serbians maintained their position. A decisive engagement was skilfully evaded, but there was continuous and heavy fighting which took bloody toll of the invader.

Then again the Serbians retired, even drawing in their forces in the north and leaving Belgrade itself in the hands of the enemy. Again Vienna was illuminated in triumph. The whole of the rich Morava valley lay open to them, and the Serbian capital which they had almost come to look upon as impregnable, was at last theirs. The closing of the net about the grim little Serbian army intrenched among the hills, seemed to the Austrians to be a mere incident of the final scene of the drama.

A very different view prevailed at the Serbian headquarters, they had staked their all upon the certain exhaustion of the enemy rank and file, through their own continuous efforts, and upon overconfidence on the part of the Austrian leaders, born of a success more apparent than real. The Serbian High Command set as small a value upon mere occupation of territory as Marshal Foch himself, and looked for victory only in the destruction of the fighting power of their adversary.

On the 3d of December Serbia's patience was justified. Contemptuously, and without attempt at concealment, in preparation of the closing of the net, the Austrians began the transfer of large masses of troops from their western front down to the lower Morava, in the very face of their vigilant enemy.

The Serbians had correctly gauged Austrian character just as surely as the Austrians had failed to gauge theirs. Serbia struck with all her usual tre-

mendous vigor, and the Austrians, taken utterly by surprise, were given no chance to recover themselves. Their great superiority in numbers and guns, availed them nothing, defeat became rout, and rout hopeless panic, in which men throwing away their arms, fled wildly for their lives, leaving their wounded behind them. Five full Austrian corps were cut to pieces, and with the exception of sixty thousand prisoners, not an Austrian soldier remained on Serbian soil. The Austrian occupation of Belgrade had endured exactly thirteen days.

There have been two great routs in the war comparable to this one of December, 1914—when Von Hindenburg gained his fame by the destruction of a Russian army, and the rout of the Italians by the Austrians, but in neither of these was the gallantry and heroism of the victors so marked a factor, nor did the results prove to have so great a bearing on the final outcome of the war. Serbia had effectually blocked the road of the Central Powers to the East, and she continued to hold it inviolate for nearly a year longer. And, as has already been said, the inestimable value of that service to the Allies and to Christian civilization can only be correctly gauged by the historian of the future, who may be able to apportion its place to each incident in the drama of the great world war.

The Austrian prisoners brought the scourge of typhus upon Serbia, which in the spring of 1915 swept away a tenth of her population, and in the closing months of the same year through the blundering of allied statesmanship, all Serbia was delivered to the ravaging of combined Austrians, Germans and Bulgarians. The tragic story of these months abounds in interest and deeds of high heroism, but it is, perhaps, only the famous retreat of the Serbians over the mountains to the sea in the winter of 1915, that should be dealt with here.

When in November, 1915, Serbia stood with her back against the mountain wall, cut off from all help and incapable of further effective resistance, she might well have accepted the peace offered her, as Montenegro and Roumania did later in less desperate circumstances. Her part in the war would then have ended, and with it her services to the allied cause: But since the days of Kossovo, when on that June morning of the year 1389, Tsar Lazar chose defeat and death for himself and his people, rather than dishonor, no other choice has been thinkable to his descendants. The Serbian heavy guns and everything serviceable to the enemy, which could not be carried on men's backs over precipitous mountain passes, were destroyed. The lighter guns were taken to pieces and shouldered by the men, and the army, accompanied by multitudes of refugees, old men, women and children began that great retreat to the Adriatic, which will be famed in song and story in the ages to come. The horrors of that journey over the mountains, through the ice and snow, have been told in part by Americans and English of the Red Cross who shared them.

The survivors who reached the coast were mere

shadows of men broken by famine, exposure and their incredible exertions. The High Command expected to find supplies and new equipment waiting for the army, and then joined to the Montenegrins they were confident of being able to hold the country of the Black Mountain against any force that the invaders could bring against them. They were doomed to disappointment, their allies had again found it impossible to give them this help, and they were met by a rain of shells from Austrian destroyers on the sea and of bombs from Austrian airplanes in the sky. Ultimately, after terrible sufferings, the civilian refugees were transhipped by the Italians to Brindisi, and the Montenegrins, proving unable to offer effective resistance to the Austrian advance, the remnant of the Serbian army continued its retreat down the coast to Durazzo. The road was little more than a rough trail cut by swift running streams with deep and treacherous fords. Fortier Jones, the American, says that this march from Scutari to Durazzo cost Serbia "thousands of her precious men," for "deadly as the deadliest fire was that intolerable extra burden coming at the end of their miraculous retreat."

If, as Fortier Jones says, the retreat of the Serbian army had been "miraculous," its recovery on the island of Corfu where it at last found refuge was yet more so.

The camp at Corfu has been described by those who saw it as "half hospital, half charnal house," where thousands of men died, not of disease, but of pure physical exhaustion and from lack of the nursing which it was impossible to give them. A place where "tents were few and beds were fewer." Yet it was at this camp that the army was reorganized, and it was these same broken men who by the end of May were driving the Bulgarians on the Salonika front. This army had been reduced to seven divisions, six of infantry and one of cavalry, numbering about 150,000 men in all, but it was an important element of the allied army under General Sarraït. It was the Serbians who carried by storm the bald summit of Kjmaklealan, over 8,000 feet above the sea, which had been pronounced impregnable both by those who held it and by those who had sought to take it. And it was they also who forced the passage of the Cherna, making untenable the strong Kenali line upon which the allied forces had been unable to make an impression, and finally carrying the last hills that guarded Monastir marched victorious into the city on November 19, 1916. The French troops marched into the town from the opposite side, but, said a gallant French colonel saluting, "It is thanks to the Serbians that we have won Monastir."

During the remainder of 1916 and in 1917 and the first half of 1918, there was no general offensive undertaken on the Salonika front. There was almost continuous fighting, and the Serbians won many local successes, but the Allies on this front had no reserves, they were confronted by an army of Bulgarians and Germans quite their equal in numbers and somewhat their superiors, at least in heavy artillery. Moreover, the enemy held a very strong line in a difficult coun-

try. There were two abortive attempts at a partial offensive in 1917, which through lack of power to concentrate a sufficiently heavy artillery fire at any given point were foredoomed to failure.

The Serbian general headquarters believed that with a moderate re-enforcement of men and guns, the Bulgarian line could be broken, Bulgaria and Turkey quickly put out of action, and a strong attack made upon Austria-Hungary, the weak joint in the Teuton armor. They urged that such a course must result in a victorious ending of the war within a measurable short space of time.

Other counsels prevailed at Paris, and perhaps wiser counsels, for any weakening of the western front might have brought fatal disaster there before the blow in the east could be delivered. It is a point that will be hotly argued in the days to come between "Easterners" and "Westerners."

Until the collapse of Russia and of Roumania two divisions of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes did excellent service on those fronts, and about half of them succeeded in joining the main army at Monastir before the final offensive of 1918.

When permission for the offensive of 1918 was given, the rejoicing in the Serbian trenches surpassed all bounds. There could be no element of surprise, for owing to the dominance of his position every move was open to the inspection of the enemy.

At zero hour the whole Serbian army swept forward, and, aided by two French divisions, began the attack. Almost simultaneously the other allied forces advanced along the whole front.

In forty-eight hours of fierce fighting the Serbians smashed through the lines so long called impregnable, and were in close pursuit of the Bulgars. After that there was never a pause, and in the first five days the Serbians advanced thirty-eight miles on a sixteen-mile front. In forty-five days of forced marches and continuous fighting the first Serbian army covered four hundred and forty-nine miles without revictualling, and toward the last, barefoot. In two weeks the Bulgaro-German army of half a million men was forced to surrender. Ninety thousand prisoners, over eight hundred cannon and immense quantities of war materials were taken.

The offensive opened on September 15, on the second of November the Serbians were in Belgrade, and by the 14th the whole of Jugo-Slavia had been cleared of the enemy.

It was Serbia's part in the war to give instantly and without thought of consequences "all that she had and all that she was" in the cause of right and justice.

It was hers to furnish men with an example for all time of how a nation may worthily "Fear God and take its own part."

It was hers to hold the Gateway of the East inviolate, even unto death, until the imminent danger to Christian civilization which its forcing threatened, had passed.

It was hers to be the cutting edge of the sword of the Allies which brought down Bulgaria and Turkey,

and was largely instrumental in the humbling of Austria.

And it was hers to suffer and to bear, with unexampled fortitude such ravage, such wreck and ruin, such losses of her men and her women and her little children—all that she held most dear—as has befallen no other nation engaged in the world struggle.

SERBIAN RELIEF WORK.

The field of the Serbian Relief Committee of America is in the Chachak district, sixty or seventy miles south of Belgrade where the need is greatest. It has inaugurated a program of wide scope which looks to the present and future care of forty thousand war orphans. The Serbian government has given a military barracks which formerly housed a thousand men, the Serbian church has given ten thousand acres of rich church lands and four monasteries lying within a radius of forty miles of Chachak, and the people throughout the entire district stand ready to take into their families, as far as they are able, children assigned to them and to care for them under the supervision of the committee's trained workers.

The entire work of the committee radiates from the center at Chachak, and is directed by the committee's commissioner for Serbia, Mr. William A. Doherty.

It will be seen that such a program for complete success requires the generous support of a wide public, and there is no better way of furnishing that support than through the "adoption" system as used by the committee. Groups of friends, clubs and associations of all kinds may join in the adoption of one or more war orphans as they may feel able, dividing the cost among the members. The relief is not given to an abstraction, but to a definite boy or girl of whom the committee furnishes a photograph and short history. A personal relationship is established which is found to have a very distinct value, both to the giver and to the child.

THE SERBIAN RELIEF COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

79 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

WILLIAM JAY SCHIEFFELIN, Chairman.

ALLAN M. GALE, Publicity Department.

PROGRAM FOR WORK IN SERBIA FOR THE SERBIAN RELIEF COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

I. General Plan.

To assist the Serbian people in the solution of their child-caring and public health problems, the committee has developed the following program of work.

It is proposed to organize and operate in Serbia, the American Home and Health Centre for Children, which shall serve as a model of what may be accomplished by the establishment of such an agency, and which, from the standpoint of method and cost, may be adopted by Serbian communities generally.

The work will be conducted in such a manner that it shall serve as a training school for the Serbs in modern child-caring, medical and sanitary methods.

As the work develops, the number of Serbian personnel and the degree of Serbian participation will be increased, so that when the Serbian Relief Committee of America withdraws from the field, the activities may be continued along the lines projected with a minimum of interruption.

II. Activities.

(A) CHILD-CARING.

There will be established at Chachak, the Serbian headquarters of the committee, the Children's Home and

Health Centre for the reception of such Serbian orphan children as may be entrusted to the care of the committee.

In connection with this Children's Centre there will be established:

- (a) Necessary clinics for the physical, medical and mental examination of all children proposed for admission;
- (b) hospital and dispensaries for the medical, surgical and dental treatment of children needing such attention;
- (c) placing-out division for the purpose of securing free foster family homes for such children as are physically, mentally and morally fit for placing in family homes;
- (d) boarding-out division to provide family boarding homes for children for whom free family homes are not available.
- (e) infant welfare work to deal with infants under the age of two years, and to give them and their mothers the special attention which they require. In the work of this division special attention will be given to all questions concerning infant mortality;
- (f) training school for boys and girls for whom institutional care is deemed necessary. This training school is to be equipped and conducted along most approved lines, and, in addition to providing care and elementary education, will include in its curriculum, instruction and training in:
 - (1) manual training, agriculture, animal husbandry, poultry raising, dairying, horticulture and intensive gardening, for such boys as are of an age and physically adapted for such training.
 - (2) domestic science, elementary home economics, plain sewing (hand and machine), poultry raising, intensive gardening, horticulture, etc., for the girls.
- (g) after-care division for the purpose of keeping in touch with children discharged from the training school.

(B) PUBLIC HEALTH.

- (a) The establishment of a health centre at the headquarters at Chachak with branch health centres or dispensaries in near-by and adjoining centres of population;
- (b) the employment of nurses, health visitors or trained social workers in connection with each of these dispensaries to visit the homes of the patients, inform the physicians as to home conditions, and aid in securing such changes therein, and in giving such relief as the physicians deem necessary for the welfare of the patients;
- (c) carrying on an educational effort throughout the department by means of exhibits, lectures, leaflets and otherwise which will attract patients to the dispensaries, disseminate information with regard to the nature, treatment and prevention of prevalent diseases, and create public opinion which will support progressive action by the authorities along public health lines;
- (d) establishment of centres for the training of Serbian women as health visitors or relief workers, these courses of training to be short (not over six months), and to provide such training as is needed to deal with the diseases and conditions found to be prevalent in the locality;
- (e) enlisting the aid of the Serbian people in the establishment of such hospitals, laboratories or other agencies as may be found necessary for the treatment of the diseases found by the dispensary experience to be prevalent, and to require hospital treatment or laboratory facilities;
- (f) suggestion to the Serbian authorities of such measures for the treatment and prevention of diseases as local conditions indicate, and assistance to local authorities in carrying such measures into effect;
- (g) the dispensary and the home visiting connected therewith will be used as a means of ascertaining the local conditions and needs, and all future activities will be adapted to the condition and needs so ascertained rather than according to any pre-conceived plan.

Anglo-American Diplomatic Relations during the Last Half-Century

BY CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Between two nations like John Bull and Uncle Sam, sons of the same family but resident in different hemispheres, one might thoughtlessly expect diplomatic relations so continuously friendly as to furnish scanty materials for the historian. The reverse has been true.

Though we were indeed often an almost negligible item among England's international worries, our own diplomatic history between the Revolution and our Civil War is chiefly a record of controversies and hard-won agreements with Great Britain.

The fact that both peoples used the tongue of Shakespeare, and held the faith and morals of Milton, was not always clearly helpful. It was too easy for each to hear and read what the other said.

For Uncle Sam, the resentments arising from two wars, one for independence and one for sailors' rights, became traditional, an inheritance handed from one generation to another. Knowing little of Europe except England, he personified in that country, really most like himself, many of those assumptions of caste which he had discarded.

John Bull, on the other hand, or at any rate his dominant classes who were the only vocal part of him in the Napoleonic era, agreed with most other European observers that our political system was a short-lived experiment, foredoomed to failure. Knowing little of democracies except the recent "red fool fury of the Seine," he believed as a matter of course that our great and growing empire and population would in time outgrow the ignorant turbulence of an unbalanced suffrage or else would crash in chaos.

Meanwhile then, as at all times since, there is no doubt that the two peoples, at the core of their souls, were secretly proud of each other, even when no pressure could have forced either publicly to admit it.

During the half-century prior to the outbreak of our Civil War our relations with England were concerned entirely with the facts of our own national growth and influence upon this continent. To us these were isolated American questions. To the British Government they were not always separate from wider issues.

We fought the war of 1812 in a rage against British assertion of a right to draft British-born seamen from our ships.

To Great Britain which did not want that war, it was only one more item in the Titanic struggle against Napoleon, and the end of that war was forgotten by England in the excitement of Napoleon's return from Elba.

To Monroe and Adams and to our people generally the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 was a new declaration of American independence, the inde-

pendence of a democratic American hemisphere from a monarchical Europe, including Great Britain.

To the British Foreign Secretary, George Canning, who suggested that proclamation, it was a strategic diplomatic move against the Holy Alliance. It was a powerful blow in behalf of the new force of nationalism, of whose claims in Greece as well as in America, England was then, as ever, the chief European champion against the continental autocrats. Canning indeed was much displeased that our Government did not associate itself with Great Britain in proclaiming the doctrine.

The fact remains that the Monroe Doctrine of America for Americans has been no less advantageous to the United States than to Great Britain, which is also a great American power, and whose fleet will defend the doctrine as long as the Union Jack flies over Canada.

Until near the middle of the nineteenth century, England as an American power used its consular, diplomatic and other agencies to oppose the extension of our influence and interests in the territories of Mexico and Central America and in the Oregon country. This opposition was based partly on the Spanish-American fear of the ambition of our Southern leaders to find new soil for slavery. That difference was ended by the emigrant rush that carried us across Texas, over the Rockies and into the valley of the Columbia river.

Another powerful influence for harmony was the English adoption of a free trade policy in 1846 which changed the traditional English attitude towards commercial competition, and drove even the sons of our old Tories in Canada into the arms of the United States in the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854.

In truth English experience with us and with Canada had imbued the English mind with the belief that self-governing colonies were a source of weakness rather than strength.

When Cobden, the apostle of free trade, became the oracle of England's economic policies, colonists were considered only as customers. Their allegiance was a matter of indifference. Cobden was thinking of a federation of the world and not of British imperial unities. The Tories believed that colonies, which under free trade could not be exploited, would become an intolerable burden. The Whigs argued that free trade would be as advantageous for colonies as for the motherland, but that if a colony wanted political as well as economic freedom it ought to have it. In this doctrine all leaders, Peel and Disraeli as well as Gladstone and Russell, coincided.

Consequently, English sentiment, intent more and more exclusively upon commercial wealth, agreed that the United States should assume control of Central

America, and offered but mild censure of the many voices that were raised in Canada for annexation.

Amid this complex of opinions about colonies, commerce and transatlantic politics, there was gradually forming in the English mind one underlying principle of diplomatic intercourse with the United States, still regarded by many Englishmen as a sort of colony, though a renegade one. That principle was the preservation and enhancement of England's commercial interests, a policy which demanded, as Cobden taught, the maintenance of peace.

The genesis of this British view of Anglo-American diplomatic relations may be traced, long before the days of Cobden and free trade, as far back as the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1818, in which Lord Castlereagh prevailed over his colleagues in the Ministry who would have guarded Canada with fleets and armies. Instead it was agreed that neither the United States nor England should maintain a war-fleet upon any of the Great Lakes. This was the most outstanding example of a diplomatic triumph of economic common-sense over political rivalries in the nineteenth century prior to the Geneva arbitration. In the same spirit the long-protracted boundary disputes affecting Maine and Oregon were settled in 1842 to 1846, the Central American and Isthmian questions disposed of in 1850 and 1856 on the basis of joint Anglo-American interest in a neutralized canal, and the old British claim to a right of search was abandoned in 1858.

The simple fact is that in the decade of the fifties the rulers of England perceived that, in addition to all the other motives for favoring the United States, the trade with America especially in cotton and cotton products had reached vast importance and value, and that, therefore, it was the wisest diplomacy for England to underwrite the one great purpose of American diplomacy, viz.: the assertion of its leadership in American affairs.

For such reasons Anglo-American diplomatic relations between 1856 and 1860 attained for a moment a level of unmistakable concord. All disputes were ended. Then came the crash of our Civil War, and suddenly all the diplomatic skill of both London and Washington was needed to prevent the two nations from reverting to the conditions of 1812.

The English and American peoples are so united in spiritual life that a civil war in one is sure to agitate and divide the other also. In 1861 each party in the United States counted confidently on the support of the English Government and people, the North because of the universal condemnation of human slavery, the South because of the importance of cotton to English commerce.

The diplomatic efforts of both were concentrated upon Great Britain. With her aid the South might win. Without her aid the Southern cause was almost hopeless, and the one European friend of the South, Louis Napoleon, would not dare to interfere directly. That England did not actively interfere on the Southern side is a proof of the power of idealism in English politics. The modern Prussian who does not

value or believe in such forces has not ceased to wonder at England's failure to seize that opportunity.

Bernhardi wrote in 1901, "Since England committed the unpardonable blunder . . . of not supporting the Southern States in the American war of secession, a rival to England's worldwide empire has appeared . . . in the form of the United States of America." The same authority, after the present great war began, marveled that we did not take advantage of England's distress to take possession of Canada. But the English Government in 1861-1865 tried in characteristic British ways to keep aloof from the American struggle. The result was that England incurred the fierce dislike of both South and North.

The Southern leaders were disappointed and angry because the English Government would not recognize the Confederacy as independent, although the Premier, Palmerston, at one time in 1862 favored such action, and because the English Government would not interfere with the Federal blockade of the Southern ports, and because English sentiment against slavery was so strong. Alexander H. Stephens even proposed to abolish slavery in the hope of thus winning English favor.

The resentment of the North had more complex elements. It became increasingly disappointed and angry for the following reasons. First, the English Government recognized in May, 1861, the belligerent rights of the Confederates. Although President Lincoln had practically done the same thing a month earlier by proclaiming the blockade, the North felt that the action had been hasty, and therefore unfriendly. Second, the sympathy of the upper and wealthier classes of English society was given not to the free North, but to the more aristocratic South. They bought Southern bonds. The *Times* thundered for the South. A majority of English writers pointed out that it would be advantageous for England to deal with two republics here instead of one, and that our crude democracy had found its inevitable end. The historian Freeman sat down to write in several volumes a "History of Federal Government, from the Foundation of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States." He published the first volume in 1863, and wrote no more. Mr. Gladstone almost disrupted Palmerston's cabinet in 1862 by announcing in a public address that Jefferson Davis and other leaders of the South had made an army, a navy and a nation. Our people noted that Gladstone's wish was the father of his thought, but could not know at the time that, by his premature and discreet eulogy he had thwarted the hope of official recognition of Southern independence, a hope that was forever extinguished by Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. Third, the English Government placed so lax an interpretation upon its neutrality laws that a half-dozen cruisers flying the Confederate flag, built in British shipyards, manned by British crews using an equipment bought in England, and permitted to use British ports as bases of supply, roamed the ocean and destroyed practically all of our merchant marine that was not sold to Englishmen.

The Laird rams, the most powerful warships that were built in England for the Confederates, and that, if set free, might have shattered our blockade, were prevented from leaving the docks, not so much by the vigilance of the British Government as by the wise courage of our Minister Adams who wrote to Earl Russell: "It would be superfluous in me to point out to your Lordship that this is war." But, in spite of all these delinquencies and blunders, the fact remains that Confederate diplomacy utterly failed to obtain any help from England to break the strangle-hold of the Federal blockade. Our own unwise laws prevented us from recovering our merchant marine after the war was over, but our public opinion was by that time too incensed against Great Britain to see or believe that, and believed that English neutrality had been purposely strained so that the only rival merchant marine might be wiped out.

Fourth, England was perfectly right in resenting the insult to her flag when Wilkes seized Mason and Slidell, and English traders were perfectly right in running our blockade if they could, but an inflamed public opinion found new grievances in all these things, and glorified Wilkes for turning the tables on the right of search.

The fact is that each nation found itself in a novel and unaccustomed role. England, usually a belligerent, had to learn how to be a neutral. The United States, usually a neutral champion of unrestricted commerce and hostile to blockades, had to learn how to conduct a successful blockade of enormous extent. In order to achieve the latter purpose, we devised the doctrine of the "continuous voyage" so that we might interfere with neutral commerce between the neutral ports of Liverpool and Nassau.

With that doctrine the English blockade in the World War had been choking Germany, and our protests were met by quoting our own arguments in the time of the Civil War. Fifth, Canada sheltered many Southern sympathizers and Confederate refugees who planned to wreck bridges and railway trains, to scatter disease germs in Northern cities, and who directed brigand raids across the border. For this menace upon our Northern frontier the North held both Canada and England responsible, although it is sufficiently evident that officers of the law in Canada were not intentionally remiss in preserving neutrality.

The majority of the governing class in England were convinced that the South would win and wished it to. The Cabinet, as a whole, intended to play fair, but they were sluggish and delinquent in enforcing neutrality and acted through unwilling agents. Earl Russell sent an order to detain the Alabama at Liverpool, but the order was not delivered until after the Alabama had sailed. On the other hand, the British Government steadily refused to join the sham Napoleon in aid to the South. In doing this it powerfully defended the Monroe Doctrine at a moment when we were unable to do it ourselves. If this republic had been split in two, neither fragment could have been predominant in American affairs and the European rulers would easily have used our political

systems as make-weights in their perilous balance of power.

The British Government refused to receive Mason, the Confederate envoy, and turned down every proposal for mediation or intervention. When it became evident that the triumph of the North would destroy slavery, English sympathy for the Union cause increased daily. The laborers of Lancashire, led by John Bright, though in distress through the paralysis of the cotton mills, stood firm for human freedom. Both nations were well served by the men to whom their diplomatic interests were entrusted. Lord Lyons, the British Minister at Washington, was a model of discretion, and Charles Francis Adams at the Court of St. James was as fortunate a choice for us as was Lincoln in the White House. In character, manner, education and abilities Mr. Adams was exactly adapted to his difficult task. He found out every move of his opponents, and if he could not thwart them outright he recorded with dignity and tact his protests in the right place and at the right times. He kept his temper and his friends. He made no mistakes. Above all, he patiently accumulated such a mass of information and evidence that after the war, when the time came for England and the United States to settle accounts, he was absolutely master of the situation.

We have always sent our ablest sons to be our diplomatic representatives in England. That roll of honor outshines our list of Presidents in intellectual power, carrying, as it does, the names of three Adamsons, two Pinckneys, John Jay, Albert Gallatin, Martin Van Buren, Edward Everett, George Bancroft, Reverdy Johnson, James Russell Lowell, E. J. Phelps, Thomas F. Bayard, John Hay and Joseph Choate. No other among them bore a burden so heavy as that of the third Adams. His countrymen never fully realized the value of his public service because his victories were won in the invisible realms of diplomacy. In my judgment his campaigns were in their way as vital to the preservation of our republic as were those of Grant.

Mr. Lincoln had no diplomatic experience, and when he became President had little knowledge of international affairs. His marvelous acquaintance with human nature and his common sense enabled him to gauge his international responsibilities with more sagacity than that shown by Jefferson Davis, who was a man of better education and wider experience in public service; more, too, than by Seward, whose emotional brainstorms Lincoln curbed before his Administration was three months old.

It is curious that Lincoln's repression of Seward's rash desire to quarrel with England and France in 1861 was exactly duplicated in England six months later by the Prince Consort and Queen Victoria, who took the sting out of Lord Russell's dispatch concerning the seizure of Mason and Slidell.

Both nations were happy in the possession of rulers who remained sane, even when the people were angry and politicians lost their heads. Perhaps the Execu-

tive task would have been harder if the newspapers of those days had been fed by transatlantic cables.

As the Civil War deepened, the bonds of amity between this country and England grew weaker. When the detention of the *Laird* rams, in 1863, showed that the British Government had decided to adopt a stricter theory of neutrality, Mr. Adams offered to submit to arbitration our claims for damages caused by the *Alabama* and its sister cruisers. Lord Russell refused on the ground that the question involved the national honor, and therefore could not be submitted to arbitration. It was already determined in 1864 that the United States would not renew the Reciprocity Treaty with Canada, which would come to its term in 1866. That treaty was doomed not only by the resentment against both England and Canada, but also by the rapid growth of protectionist sentiment in the United States under the new war tariff.

The raids of Confederate sympathizers across the Canadian border in 1864 directly impelled our Government to notify Great Britain that the agreement of 1817 for mutual disarmament on the Great Lakes would end in the following year.

Lord Lyons wrote to his chief: "There can, unhappily, be no doubt that three-quarters of the American people are eagerly longing for a safe opportunity of making war with England. . . . The ill-will shows itself in many ways—principally in vexatious proceedings in regard to the neighboring colonies." In the American and Canadian parliaments alike members began to talk of gunboats and fortifications on the frontiers. In the House of Commons Lord Palmerston in February, 1865, used these words of studied moderation: "We cannot deny that things did take place on the Lakes of which the United States were justly entitled to complain; and if the measures to which they have recourse are simply calculated, as they say, for the protection of their commerce and their citizens, I think they are perfectly justified in having recourse to them."

The most far-reaching result of these coils of circumstance was the birth of Canadian unity and nationality in the formation of a federation of British colonies, out of which has grown the modern Dominion of Canada. This new nation was heralded in conferences in Canada and London in the winter of 1865. Although the notice of abrogation of the agreement of 1917 was soon withdrawn by our Government and the rapid collapse of the Confederacy greatly relieved the tension on both sides of the ocean, the Canadians felt that our new tariff closed to them the doors of the United States. The new strength of the great republic evoked an answering assertion of national power in Canada. This rising tide of British loyalty was swollen by a fresh threat of war along the border from Fenian organizations in the United States. The militant Irish on both sides of the ocean confidently expected that the controversies between England and the United States would result in war, as soon as our armies and fleets were free to act. Finding that the wounds showed some tendency to heal rather than to fester, the Fenian leaders started to conquer England

by way of Canada on their own account in 1866, in 1870, and again in 1871, ridiculous affairs in which many ignorant honest men were dupes. These disgraceful provocations were ended forever by the triumph of peaceful diplomacy in the treaty of Washington in 1871 and the ensuing arbitration tribunal at Geneva in 1872.

The Fenian adventurers defeated their own object. Our Government could not afford to be lax in policing Canadian borders at the time when it was pressing upon England a claim for damages because England had been remiss in performing its neutral duties.

The worst obstacle to peaceful solutions was not the Fenian, but the incendiary talk of reckless politicians in our Congress and in our press, and the extravagant plans of dreamers like Charles Sumner.

Senator Sumner in 1869 wielded for the moment an exceptional influence. He was chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, and by reason of his long martyrdom from Brooks' assault no less than by reason of his abilities he was a dominant intellectual force in the Republican party. He was supposed to have the confidence of the new President, Grant, and he secured the appointment of his close friend, John Lothrop Motley, as Minister to England. Sumner agreed with Seward that England should be held responsible for all losses that Americans had suffered not only by the depredations of Confederate privateers, but by the substitution of the British merchant marine for our own. His bill for these losses was two and a half billions of dollars. He told the Senate and the world that the only way to ensure peace in this hemisphere was to banish the English flag from it and substitute the Stars and Stripes. Estimating that the whole of British America was fairly worth about two and a half billions of dollars, he seriously proposed to cancel all claims against England and begin the new reign of peace and brotherly love on condition of receiving from England the title to all her possessions, continental and insular, within the New World.

English statesmen, on the other hand, were only waiting to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. The traditional belief among them that the American republic would not long endure died when Lee surrendered. English public opinion, except among a few extreme Tories, admitted that the Americans had cause for complaint, and that some reparation was due for the mistakes of Palmerston's administration. With the Liberal party, which came into power in 1869, were aligned most of the English groups who had been staunch supporters of the North during the war. Mr. Gladstone, the new Premier, who had shaken off all relics of his original Toryism, was convinced of the wisdom of yielding to the claims of the United States as soon as it could be safely done.

Even on the subject of Canadian annexation responsible British leaders were still holding Cobden's doctrine. The *London Times*, discussing in 1869 the inchoate Canadian Confederation, declared that England would not withstand the colonies if they preferred to slip into the Union rather than the Domin-

ion, and added: "Instead of the Colonies being the dependencies of the Mother Country, the Mother Country has become the dependency of the Colonies. We are tied while they are loose. We are subject to danger, while they are free."

Lord Clarendon in 1870 wrote to Lord Lyons: "I wish that the Canadians would propose to be independent and to annex themselves. We can't throw them off and it is very desirable that we part as friends." Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister at Washington, remarked to our Secretary, Hamilton Fish, in 1869, "England does not wish to keep Canada, but cannot part with it without the consent of the population."

The time when that consent could have been obtained was gone, probably forever.

At first no one in England and but few in the United States realized what a surging tide of British-Canadian loyalty was sweeping through the new Dominion, and that Sir John Macdonald had indeed created a new nation. Canadian sentiment spoke with no uncertain voice, and again English statesmen began to revise their traditions concerning self-governing colonies.

With the beginning of a new administration at Washington in 1869, the ground was soon cleared for a complete reconstruction of Anglo-American relations. Sumner led in the Senatorial rejection of the first attempt to agree upon the questions in dispute—the Johnson-Clarendon Convention of 1868-9, but his influence was soon after shattered by his quarrel with Grant who could be led but not driven. Motley was forced to resign. Sumner was driven from his chairmanship, and Secretary Fish abandoned Sumner's grandiose plan of annexing British America. Sumner thereupon inscribed Fish also upon his list of lost souls.

England meanwhile had discovered during the Franco-Prussian battle summer of 1870 new and cogent reasons for amity with the United States on the basis of strict definitions of neutrality. It is perhaps not too much to say that England was hampered in its dealings with that European conflict by its relations with the United States. Sir Edward Thornton admitted that he could see how the ocean might swarm with Alabamas, preying this time on British instead of American commerce.

Both sides were now ready for the final definitive treaty of peace of the Civil War, which was finished at Washington, May 8, 1871, the Canadian Macdonald sitting at the table as one of the English Commissioners.

Each nation yielded somewhat. England agreed to submit her administration of her own statutes to an alien tribunal, and to accept the American definition of neutrality as better than her own. The United States dropped the question of annexation, indirect claims for damages and the alleged premature recognition of the Confederacy as a belligerent. Each nation gained both materially and spiritually. Two great principles of concord were comprehensively applied, reciprocity in commercial relations so far as

our tariff system would permit, and arbitration in all pending controversies. The reciprocity included free use of waterways and international rivers and a new agreement on the perennial Canadian fisheries dispute. Arbitration was set up for a boundary dispute in Puget Sound and for three classes of disputed claims for damages, among which the Alabama claims rightly overshadowed all the others. It is sad to record that our Administration nearly wrecked this arbitration at the outset by including a part of the claims for indirect damages in the instructions to our advocates before the tribunal. This bit of sharp practice, intended for political effect in this country, was properly resented by the British Government, which threatened to abandon the arbitration. The honor of the United States and the promise of the new era were saved by Charles Francis Adams, who again deserved well of the republic by inducing the tribunal itself to refuse consideration of indirect claims.

The treaty of 1871 and its ensuing arbitrations were, as I have said, a concluding chapter in our Civil War. He would be woefully mistaken who should think of it as a mere settlement of accounts with cash. The United States received fifteen and a half millions of dollars because England had allowed the Confederate cruisers to slip out of its harbors, and the United States paid to England two millions of dollars for damage that we inflicted upon British subjects during the war, and paid five and a half millions for ten years' use of the Canadian inshore fisheries, but these facts were in themselves relatively unimportant. Neither was there anything novel in arbitration. But the beginning of a new era for the English-speaking race lay in the fact that these two nations, trembling almost upon the verge of war, had without any other compulsion than that which arises from self-control, referred to judicial process disputes of a character and importance never before settled in such a manner.

The greater triumph was England's, because it was large-hearted enough to submit to that judicial review an issue which its own Government had once declared to be a question of national honor. England's attitude in this treaty and its sequences was intended to be an acknowledgment that the American runaway son had won the right to sit at the family table as an equal, that English society had blundered in supposing that the republic would not endure, and that henceforth it would not be England's fault if friendly relations with the United States were not preserved.

Shortly before the treaty of Washington, Minister Motley gathered the one laurel of his short stay in England in the form of a treaty or convention in which Gladstone's government abandoned, in relation to the United States, the European theory of inalienable citizenship, and accepted the American principle of citizenship by naturalization. This demolished the last cornerstone of the ancient British claim to a right of search and impressment of seamen.

Naturally the English political party which translated these ideas into deeds was the party of modern

English democracy. Necessarily the final triumph of a democracy of freemen in the United States reacted strongly, even though obscurely, upon the progress of democracy in the motherland.

The United States was not so quickly aware, as was England, that in Anglo-American relations old things had passed away. The consolidation of practically all British America into a new empire, with a patriotic national sentiment as insistent, aggressive and vocal as ours had ever been, only occasionally arrested our attention.

Whatever provocation lay in boundaries and fisheries was now Canadian as well as English. While England, in watching Canadian growth, learned a new lesson in imperial values, the United States seemed unable to formulate any consistent policy towards the new nation, beyond building up a tariff wall against it. Although Fenianism died out, the militant Irish sentiment in the United States, joined to the old colonial traditions, continued to wield a voting power to which cheap politicians readily appealed by the easy process called "twisting the lion's tail." For about twenty-five years American diplomacy was conducted as an auxiliary to domestic politics. In the latter part of the decade of the eighties our diplomats were trying at the same hour to claim the right of our fishermen to use Eastern Canadian harbors and our right to exercise an exclusive control over Behring Sea and its seal fisheries. Secretary Blaine fell between the two stools. When the seal controversy, which, although not considered as involving a danger of war, had become very acute, was by treaty in 1892 referred to arbitration, the tribunal sitting at Paris in 1893 decided adversely to the United States in every particular. Our Government paid about half a million of dollars in damages for its short-lived attempt to claim an exclusive right to police the high seas.

Mr. Blaine also followed Mr. Evarts in a strenuous assertion that any Isthmian Canal must be under American control without aid from any other power, and Mr. Blaine at least seemed somewhat disconcerted to discover subsequently that our Clayton-Bulwer treaty with England recognized the principle of joint international responsibility. But what Blaine formulated, Frelinghuysen changed, and what Frelinghuysen favored, Bayard rejected.

Again, Blaine's second term in the Department of State was soon followed by Cleveland's Democratic administration, and that introduced Richard Olney, who was Blaine's antithesis.

Blaine was an imaginative, expansive promoter, as some one said, "half charlatan, half genius." Olney was an acute but narrow jurist. Cleveland was a man of unusual force, but no genius. Yet to these two men it fell to force Great Britain to listen to the most audacious formulation of the Monroe Doctrine ever made, one that would have delighted Blaine's soul. It was Olney who signed the dispatch, but the President must have permitted the Secretary to say, June 20, 1895, "To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposi-

tion." The arrogance of this tactless utterance doubtless provoked Lord Salisbury to make his rasping and supercilious rejoinder, but it worked far greater evil among our Spanish-American neighbors whom it alarmed and irritated, even down to the present day.

Prior to 1895 Great Britain had never formally acknowledged the Monroe Doctrine, the one most cherished international policy of our people, feeling perhaps that Great Britain was also an owner of the doctrine, and, like ourselves, an American power. But for fifty years Venezuela and Great Britain had disagreed concerning the boundary of Venezuela and British Guiana. Venezuela offered arbitration. Great Britain refused. Attempts on our part to suggest solutions had been turned down by the British Government, usually with an air of civil indifference. Lord Salisbury mistook President Cleveland's repeated protests as specimens of the American pastimes of bluster and tail-twisting. So he took occasion to explain to Mr. Cleveland that the Monroe Doctrine was not international law, and did not entitle the United States to butt into every American boundary dispute, and that the connection between England and her American colonies was not, as Mr. Olney had implied it was, unnatural, inexpedient and temporary.

But Mr. Cleveland was in earnest, and not bluffing, as the noble lord supposed him to be. Through his mouth in December, 1895, the United States said to Salisbury: "The Venezuela dispute will be settled in accordance with our judgment of the right, if we have to fight for it." Forthwith Congress unanimously adopted Mr. Cleveland's recommendation that an American Commission be appointed to find out where the Venezuelan boundary ought to be.

This defiance was the first intimation to most people on both sides of the water that there was any trouble brewing. The result in England was an almost universal shout, "War with America is unthinkable."

Three hundred and fifty-four members of the House of Commons sent to our Government a signed memorial in favor of an agreement to submit to arbitration all future questions at issue between the two countries. Salisbury found that his own people had, for the most part, deserted him; Englishmen cared little about the Venezuelan jungle and were regretfully surprised that the Yankees should be interested in it. They were fiercely angry at a coincident German interference in South Africa in the form of a telegram from the Kaiser to President Kruger about the Jameson raid. It was clear to Salisbury that it was an inauspicious time for any difference with the United States. He seized the first opportunity to concede everything to arbitration and to tacitly acknowledge the American interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, in these words, addressed to Ambassador Bayard: "I have empowered Sir Julian Pauncefote to discuss the question either with the representative of Venezuela, or with the Government of the United States, acting as the friend of Venezuela."

This affair produced a profound impression upon

the statesmen of Continental Europe, who were no more astonished by the character of Cleveland's action than by the eager acquiescence of English public opinion. It brought home to Europe, and especially to Germany, the fact that the people of these great English-speaking nations were in accord, even though Governments differed. A leading German journal summed up the whole affair as "the joint action of the two Anglo-Saxon powers." What had begun as though it were a threat of war had ended in a demonstration of unexpected unity and friendship.

This was, in my opinion, the first convincing demonstration among democratic nations of the truth that, as Elihu Root phrased it, the time has come when peoples and not governments determine international relations.

How real and strong was the cordiality of the English people towards the United States was not fully realized by our people until we entered upon the war for the rescue of Cuba. Great Britain was the only great power that welcomed that action and appreciated the ethical conviction and the idealism that impelled us. When the news of our declaration of war against Spain reached London, in April, 1898, within six hours the city bloomed with American flags, and great crowds of cheering people gathered before the American Embassy. The multitude rejoiced that we were going to abate a nuisance in the name of freedom, justice and the racial conception of law and order. Here and there a more thoughtful voice reminded us that, in wiping out the last vestiges of Spanish rule—and misrule—in the New World, we were completing the work which Drake, Hawkins and Raleigh began, and vindicating our right to be joint heirs of the men who destroyed the Great Armada and wrested North America from the grasp of a vicious autocracy.

The precise date at which the United States became qualified to rank as one of the Great World Powers is a mooted question. Some might carry it as far back as the War of 1812, or at least to the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine. Some would connect it with our expansion to the Pacific coast during the Mexican war. Others would identify the date with the revelation of the inner strength of our federal union by its triumph during the period of civil war.

Still others would find evidence in the division of Samoa between the United States, Great Britain and Germany in 1889, and for a second time in 1899, an act which Mr. Cleveland in 1894 condemned as our first disregard of Washington's injunction to avoid entangling alliances with foreign powers. Closely connected with this new policy in the Pacific was our annexation of the Hawaiian islands, almost accomplished by President Harrison in February, 1893, promptly revoked by President Cleveland in the following March, and finally declared by President McKinley in 1898.

Not until our war with Spain did our people as a whole begin to realize the cumulative result of all these enlargements of our sphere of action, and to comprehend what our new duties in the world would be. Some of those who first saw these things

clearly were so alarmed by the prospect that they formed an Anti-Imperialist League in order to combat the tendency.

The leaders of public opinion in England, having had more experience than ourselves, more quickly perceived the profound changes in world politics wrought by America's thrust into the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea. British diplomats and statesmen welcomed the change, knowing that manifold common interests no less than the logic of circumstances would be more likely to place and keep America by the side of England than by that of any other great power.

When Germany and Austria-Hungary, scenting danger from afar, tried to induce France, Italy and England to join them in a protest to us, and perhaps a threat of intervention against our attack upon Spanish sovereignty in Cuba, it was Great Britain alone that crushed the plot with a flat refusal. The hiss of the German reptile press showed where the snake in the grass was. Bismarck's newspaper organ expressed its disgust that "this notoriously disreputable republic has the assurance to pose as a censor of the morals of European monarchies."

The evidence of British friendship that affected the American people most deeply was furnished by the British fleet in the harbor of Manila. We suspected then—and we now know—the reasons which brought to Manila a German fleet stronger than Dewey's and commanded by an arrogant Junker, who quarreled with our Admiral and gave aid to the Spanish foe.

Dewey sent word to Admiral von Diederich that if he wanted a fight he could have it now.

The German quickly betook himself to the English flagship and asked Captain Chichester if his instructions covered the possible case of hostilities between the German and American squadrons. The reply was affirmative. Von Diederich asked what those instructions were. "There are only two persons here," said the British captain, "who know what my instructions are, one of those persons is myself and the other is—Admiral Dewey." The German knew what that meant, but later when Dewey's fleet started from Cavité to capture the forts at Manila, the German squadron weighed anchor and followed close behind. The British warships thereupon steamed swiftly in between the Americans and the Germans and stopped. The hint was plain and the Germans departed.

Knowledge of all this English friendliness induced among our people an unwonted cordiality in return. During the next year and after, our Government maintained a frankly benevolent neutrality towards England in its struggle with the Boers. When the Boer delegates, unofficially present at the White House, tried to introduce the subject of the war, President McKinley replied by inviting them to admire the beauty of the view from the windows.

Undoubtedly a salient feature of Anglo-American diplomatic relations from Jay's treaty to the present day has been the use of arbitration, as a method of resolving disputes. The Alabama arbitration in 1872 was the most dramatic instance of it. The disquiet

caused by Cleveland's Venezuela message gave a mighty impetus to Anglo-American popular interest in arbitration. Mr. Cleveland always contended that his strong vindication of the Monroe Doctrine was essential for the maintenance of peace. It is undeniable that from that event there dates a remarkable series of arbitrations and a worldwide agitation in behalf of the principle.

The first effort was a failure. In the winter of 1897, shortly before the Venezuelan boundary was finally referred to arbitration, Secretary Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote drafted a universal arbitration treaty between England and the United States. The United States Senate did not ratify it, greatly to the disappointment of the more liberal spirits on both sides of the ocean. The truth is that this country was not ready for so comprehensive an agreement. American opinion could not endure the possible subjection of the Monroe Doctrine to an alien tribunal. Moreover, the sky was not entirely cleared from the Venezuelan flurry.

The Democratic party, obsessed by Bryan's quixotic vagaries, was imbued with the idea that imperialist England and capitalist Wall Street had combined to crucify the laboring world upon "a cross of gold." Cleveland's administration, which was responsible for the proposed treaty, had become a political anomaly. The few friends it had were chiefly in the camp of the opposing political party.

The wreck of the Democratic party in the Presidential election of 1896 resulted in the unbroken ascendancy of the opposing party for sixteen years, 1897 to 1913. One fortunate result of such a long tenure of power was an unusual continuity in our foreign policies. Another fortunate circumstance was the revelation, already mentioned, of friendly sympathy between the peoples of the two nations during the Spanish and Boer wars. To many people, in the United States at least, that revelation was as surprising as it was gratifying.

The good-will engendered on both sides of the ocean by these events was translated into diplomatic achievement by a remarkable group of diplomats. As spokesmen for the United States, Hay and Root, Choate and Knox were statesmen whose qualifications were comparable to those of Gallatin and the Adamses. They were well matched with such English associates as Pauncefote, Grey and Bryce.

John Hay, in the autumn of 1898, came from the ambassadorship at London to be Secretary of State for President McKinley. Hay saw, more quickly than most of his countrymen, how the Spanish war had altered our international position, and he approved the change. He realized also that England was the only great Power whose sympathies were not openly hostile to us. He had a vision of the benefits that would accrue from the international co-operation of these two peoples, not only to themselves, but to the world at large. John Hay was an idealist and saw ethics at the heart of politics. He summed up his view of American diplomacy in a famous sentence, thus: "The briefest expression of our rule of con-

duct is, perhaps, the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule."

He was almost the only American who understood the aim of the Imperial German clique. Eighteen years ago, during the Boxer trouble, he wrote of "the infamy of an alliance with Germany," and declared that he would rather be the dupe of China than the chum of the Kaiser.

The first aim of Hay's diplomacy was to secure close and friendly co-operation between England and the United States in international affairs, and to remove all possible causes of friction between them. All such causes were reduced to two groups: one, disputes between the United States and British North America, some of long duration, but relating chiefly to fisheries, boundaries and trade; the other, difficulties hindering our construction of a transoceanic canal. In the latter problem England and Canada had, each, a primary interest.

English statesmen, especially those of the Liberal party, were eager to meet Secretary Hay half way. Fearful of Germany's vaulting ambition, they turned hopefully, as Canning had done a hundred years earlier, to the New World to redress the balance of the Old. Within their own borders, the obstacles to their success lay not so much in Great Britain as in Canada.

That Dominion had, since 1869, won a large place for itself in the Empire and in the world. The breed of Englishmen who once talked so indifferently about separation from Canada had become extinct. A new generation of English statesmen had arisen, who wished to defer to Canada and who summoned Colonial premiers to Imperial conferences.

The task of English diplomacy was to leave with the United States no cause for irritation, and at the same time to convince the Canadians that their interests would not be sacrificed.

On the other hand, Hay's chief obstacles to success lay in the convolutions of our party politics. There were, first the extreme Protectionists of his own party, watchful lest the oft-recurring pressure from Canadian Liberals should bring about a breach in our tariff walls; and, second, the lion's tail-twisters, both sincere and sham, whose uproar had been increased somewhat since the events of 1895-6. Hay's frame of mind is sharply expressed in a letter written in 1900 to John W. Foster, thus: "Every Senator I see says, 'For God's sake, don't let it appear we have any understanding with England.' How can I make bricks without straw? That we should be compelled to refuse the assistance of the greatest power in the world, *in carrying out our own policy*, because all Irishmen are Democrats and some Germans are fools—is enough to drive a man mad."

Under these circumstances it is apparent how great a triumph was won by the American and British delegates at the first Hague Conference in 1899. The American delegation, headed by Andrew D. White, received its instructions from Secretary Hay. The British delegation was led by Sir Julian Pauncefote. These two delegations united in support of a plan sketched by John Hay for the establishment of a per-

manent tribunal of arbitration, and they won their fight against the opposition, at the outset, of the representatives of Germany. So to Hay and to Pauncefote, more than to any other two men, the world owes the establishment of the Hague Court of Arbitration, which was the one great achievement of the Hague Conference, and which now has adjudicated fifteen international disputes.

It is not too much to say that only England and the United States in harmony could have wrought this great work. Even while they were doing it, their own last sharp controversy over Venezuela was being peacefully and finally closed by arbitration in Paris. The establishment of an ever-ready means for settling peacefully any kind of international difference anywhere in the world was an impressive outcome of Anglo-American co-operation in the first world congress ever held.

At the close of the last century there was no subject that loomed larger upon our commercial, political and financial horizons than that of an Isthmian Canal. Great Britain took a long step towards an era of good feeling when its Government consented to abandon its rights under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850. That treaty recognized at least an equality of interest of both nations in any Isthmian Canal, and pledged both of them not to colonize in Central America or to assume dominion over any part of it. That treaty had been regarded by its framers as a mutual assertion of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine. It finally became, in the American view, a principal obstacle to the construction of a canal by us. It prohibited either England or the United States from acquiring exclusive control of any Isthmian canal, prohibited the fortification of such a canal, guaranteed the neutralization of the canal, and invited other nations to join in the guarantee. To the United States, Government and citizens alike, these restrictions had become increasingly offensive, for everyone here agreed that the interoceanic canal must be made and owned by us alone. The outcome of the Spanish war compelled us to adopt and push such a policy for economic as well as for naval and political reasons. Great Britain welcomed us as a neighbor in the Pacific, and was disposed to hasten our full entrance into the circle of world powers. The Suez Canal was hers. For every reason Great Britain was willing to see the United States dig the one other strategic world canal, for it was clear that the United States would clash with any other power that undertook the task. De Lesseps' failure had made that certain.

Under such circumstances both parties were amicably ready for the new agreements drawn up by John Hay and Lord Pauncefote in final form in 1901, which swept away the restrictions to which we had objected. We were thereby set free to acquire territory in Central America, if we could, and free to dig, own and defend an interoceanic canal. But our diplomats and statesmen left in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty two sources of possible future trouble. One is an agreement that the canal tolls shall be absolutely uniform, an agreement which prevents us from grant-

ing favors to our shipping in our own canal. By reason of this promise, President Wilson and Congress in 1914, faced by a protest from Great Britain and Canada, were constrained to repeal a Federal statute which conflicted with this item in the treaty.

We naturally could not afford to place ourselves, in 1914, under the reproach of turning a treaty into "a scrap of paper." The other doubtful spot in the treaty is a curious inconsistency. We promised not to blockade the canal, although we have fortified it. If any nation at war with us tried to use the canal even in conformity with the rules defined in the treaty, it is likely that we would promptly disregard that promise. The simple truth is that England owns the Suez Canal and the United States owns the Panama Canal, and neither power intends to permit its canal to be used by its enemies in time of war. It would seem to be better to use no screens of neutralization until there is an international power which can make neutralization effective.

A joint commission met at Quebec and Washington in 1898-99, and began the work of clearing away a tangle of questions at issue between the United States and Canada. There were no less than ten roots to the tangle! Boundary questions, among which the Alaskan boundary was most important, navigation rules on the Great Lakes, wreckage and salvage, the North Atlantic fisheries, seal-hunting in the Pacific, treatment of goods in transit, treatment of criminals, alien labor especially Chinese immigration or importation, mining rights and reciprocity.

The conferences of the joint commission terminated in a deadlock, caused chiefly by the Alaskan difficulty, but the negotiations went on under other forms to a final decision by another joint commission in 1903. The American contention was sustained by the action of the one English commissioner, who voted with our three delegates against two Canadians. His vote should be attributed to policy rather than to conviction, for his Government, already aware of German ambitions, was quite unwilling to prolong indefinitely, for the remote benefit of British North America, a hopeless head-on collision with the United States. His Canadian colleagues and the people whom they represented were not reconciled to his action, but of course further discussion was futile.

Thus was laid to rest the last serious difference over a boundary line nearly four thousand miles long, extending from the Bay of Fundy to the Arctic Ocean. One more dispute, not serious in character, concerning the location of the line in Passamaquoddy Bay, was disposed of by arbitration in 1911. This long transcontinental frontier, almost every yard of which has been in dispute, but which has been finally determined by arbitration or peaceful agreement, is in itself a witness to the good sense which time and patience have evoked in Anglo-American relations. The last possible step was taken in 1908 when Messrs. Bryce and Root concluded a convention for verifying and re-marking the line from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

That year of 1908 is called by Professor Dunning the "*annus mirabilis* of diplomatic achievement."

In addition to the agreement just described, the same negotiators settled questions concerning reciprocal rights of transit for American and Canadian officers with prisoners in custody, and concerning aid to disabled mariners of either nationality on the Great Lakes without contravening antiquated maritime laws.

Of the other conventions that marked this period, the most significant was the arbitration treaty of 1908, an agreement related in spirit to the influence exerted upon English-speaking peoples by the second Hague Conference of the previous year. The treaty provided that any Anglo-American dispute concerning the interpretation of a treaty should, with the approval of the necessary constitutional authorities, be referred to the Hague Tribunal of Arbitration. With the treaty went an agreement specifically making such a reference to the provisions of the Anglo-American Convention of 1818.

The intention was to provide a safe and sane method of settling the century-long controversy over the Atlantic fisheries. This controversy which, since 1904, had waxed most acute between Newfoundland and the United States was argued in 1910, before selected members of the Hague Tribunal, sitting as an international fisheries commission. The decision upon seven mooted points was so wisely and fairly framed that all parties accepted it without reserve, and there is apparently no danger of a renewal of the old frictions.

The kindred question of seal hunting in the Alaskan waters over which bitter controversy had been waged intermittently since 1870, was not settled until the seals were almost exterminated. Unfortunately, diplomacy was too dilatory and confused to protect the herds, but at least it finally reached an amicable agreement in 1911 upon the principles of regulation, in a treaty establishing joint responsibility of the four nations involved, and prohibiting pelagic hunting for a term of years.

President Taft singled out the arbitral settlement of the disputes over the Alabama Claims, the seal-hunting and the Newfoundland fisheries as the three most substantial steps toward a permanent Anglo-American peace.

No less fundamental, in my judgment, was the treaty respecting boundary waters between the United States and Canada, which was negotiated by Messrs. Root and Bryce in 1909, and ratified in the following year. This waterways treaty is the complement of the agreement of 1817. It is a complete charter of peace with justice under law for the Great Lakes and for all other boundary waters on our northern frontiers.

Besides assuring mutual rights of free navigation it creates an International Joint Commission of three members from each country with power to decide all questions concerning "the use or obstruction or diversion of boundary waters," and then, going much further than that, authorizes the commission, upon request from either the United States or Canada, to in-

vestigate and to decide any "questions or matters of difference arising between the United States and Canada along their common frontier."¹

Its decision in such cases is to be final. English-speaking North America can thus, if it wishes, settle its own disputes with no external intervention—not even from England itself. The attempt of President Taft's administration to embody the same principle in a general arbitration treaty with England in 1911 was wrecked by the opposition of our Senate, but the waterways treaty has provided a ready means of peaceable solutions for disputes with Canada, wherein has lain heretofore the greatest danger of troublesome difficulties with England.

Of the ten or more roots of difference with Canada that Secretary Hay in 1898 hoped to remove, only three have not been rendered harmless, and they are not at present troublesome. These are questions concerning mining rights, concerning the movement of alien laborers, and concerning tariffs. The growing power of the sentiment of Canadian nationality has twice somewhat violently rejected a policy of commercial union with the United States, once in 1891, as an answer to the McKinley tariff of 1890, and again in 1912 when for the first time since 1854, the United States offered to Canada a real measure of reciprocity. But Champ Clark and others on this side of the line talked foolishly of ultimate annexation and our manifest destiny. The result was that Canadian loyalty arose and buried the suggestion of annexation and the Liberal party under an avalanche of votes. But so complete has the self-government of the Dominion become that these events cast no shadow upon our relations with Great Britain.

So matters stood when the German Kaiser began his war for world dominion, and England, plunging in to save the world from the new Napoleon, looked hopefully to us for sympathy and aid. Her mighty war-fleet swept the German flag from the seven seas, and began such a blockade of the Central Powers as the world never before saw.

Coincident with the beginning of the war was launched a vast pro-German propaganda to win the support of the United States, or at least to keep us neutral, and above all, to encourage suspicion of England's motives in the war and to nourish animosities against her. Placing Ambassador von Bernstorff in secret direction of this propaganda with apparently unlimited money at his command, the German Government hoped to use us as a club to break England's strangle-hold upon German commerce, and at the same time to create such a disintegration of morale in this country as to leave it helpless at the feet of Germany after the rest of the world was conquered. The awful truth is that this propaganda of demoralization, like that which subsequently ruined Russia, almost succeeded here.

Our Government was soon involved with England in a correspondence of protest over the rules and

¹ The Arbitration Treaty of 1908 under which this fishery question was settled was renewed in 1913, and again in 1918.

methods of blockade, and too many Americans seemed willing to take the arrogance and brutality of the German methods of warfare with no more vigorous resistance. The fires of Irish hostility to Great Britain were rekindled into a great conflagration, and every effort was made to revive the traditions of colonial animosity. To this end also whatever influence the Hearst newspapers possessed was steadily exerted.

For a long time, England, as it seems to me unwisely, conducted no counter propaganda against this campaign of demoralization. The result was that for two years and a half England and France had the defense of our liberties as well as their own, and we took no active part. They and the other Allies gave their blood and treasure in a war forced upon them by a military and feudal tyranny which was at the same time sinking our ships without notice, murdering our citizens, even women and children, and presuming to give us orders where, when and how we might use the high seas without being killed by submarines. We meanwhile were re-electing a President because "he kept us out of war." The Huns thought they were safe in pushing their submarine warfare to its most ruthless extremity.

And then the heirs of the men of Bunker Hill and King's Mountain awoke and overwhelmed the pro-German, ultra-pacifist, defeatist, anti-English advocates. The President stood forth, like a new Jefferson, the prophet of a greater democracy, of a Monroe Doctrine for the world. Government and people began to move and march together in the same spirit that triumphed at Marston Moor and Naseby, at Saratoga and Yorktown, all English battles in which our liberties were won.

And so in April, 1917, the United States marched into the place where it belonged, and opened a new chapter of Anglo-American unity which shall, please God! be a long one.

The bonds which now hold the United States and England together are not diplomatic. We have signed no treaty. We are not members of the Entente. We were technically co-belligerents rather than allies. But the alliance between us is stronger than most of those made by treaty, because it is the outcome of identical emotions in peoples who are thinking the same thoughts and are cherishing the same ideals of democracy, justice and liberty. For this reason it has been easy for us, since we entered the war, to do almost incredible things, to place our naval power under the virtual control of the English Admiralty, to join with England in putting our armies under the command of a Frenchman, to join with England and her allies in the common control of the financial credit, the food, the transportation facilities, the war supplies and the raw materials of practically the whole world. That England and the United States are together the most powerful members of this vast yet close alliance is undeniable. The harmony between us could scarcely have been greater if George III had never meddled with our ancient English liberties, and we had never separated from the

motherland. Together we share in the victory. Together we must labor for the reconstruction of the world-order. If we are wise, we will support and reinforce each other in the effort to widen our agreements into a greater unity among the nations, leagued together to maintain peace with justice under law. Great Britain is now the center of a great empire which is steadily developing towards democracy. The United States is the product of a simple plain democracy which is acquiring a great empire. The English-speaking nations have no monopoly of democracy in the world, but they have reached a plane of mutual accord, of fraternity in culture, in political purposes and ethical judgments, in economic and commercial conditions, in progress and hope for the future.

This like-mindedness makes them in a peculiar sense the hope of the world, if they will use their power in unity for the welfare of all peoples, rather than for selfish and exclusively national advantage. The British Empire is already one league of nations. The United States is another. Nowhere else in the world are there such successful examples of local self-government reconciled with strong central powers. The duty, the problem, the privilege of our statesmen is to hold these two mighty empires in harmonious action to create and maintain everywhere in the world, as Wilson has said, "a reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and supported by the organized opinion of mankind."

By a happy thought, the President elsewhere characterized the underlying principle of this utterance as "a Monroe Doctrine for the world." The two powers most concerned with the earliest promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine are also the powers on whom this latest daring expansion of it must chiefly depend.

It is a counsel of perfection not easily to be translated into deeds. The practical difficulties that hinder its realization are, some of them, within our own boundaries. But there is much to be thankful for. At a moment when all sources of dissension between Great Britain and the United States had been eliminated, these kindred peoples have been welded together in the heat of a terrible war in support of a righteous cause, and of the noblest ideals for which men can contend. Anglo-American relations can retain and perfect, if the people are wise enough to will it, this union in fact though not in name. May it never be broken!

"There are only two things in the way of Siberia's asking independence of Russia at the present time. One is the hope that a peaceable solution of the Siberian problem will greatly influence problems in Russia and the Siberian government will gradually be recognized as an All Russian Government, and the other in the fear of Japan's aggressive policy in the Orient." ("The New Nation of Asia," *Outlook* for August 6, 1910.)

Notes from the Historical Field

Prof. M. L. Bonham, of Louisiana State College of Baton Rouge, has accepted the chair of history at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. Professor Bonham was active not only in the state university, but also in promoting a historical society in Baton Rouge.

On October 11, the Nebraska State Historical Society, acting in conjunction with patriotic, military and civic organizations of Nebraska and of the United States, celebrated the first landing of a United States military force in the Upper Missouri region in the months of September and October, 1819, and the establishment of Fort Atkinson. The program included a military parade and series of patriotic addresses and a pageant representing military and Indian life a hundred years ago.

Prof. Edgar Dawson, of Hunter College, New York City, is collecting old texts and other books used in the teaching of government and civics. He already has probably the most complete sets of such works in America, and he hopes to extend his collection in order that it may be of value to all who are interested in the subject. He will be glad to correspond with persons possessing such books published earlier than 1875 with a view either to purchase or to procure transcripts of the title page and other information concerning such works.

In the July number of *History*, Mr. N. H. Baynes contributes an interesting summary of recent works bearing upon "Greek Religion and the Saviour King," in which he reviews the respective influences of Latin, Greek and Jewish traditions in forming the Christian doctrine of the Saviour King. Other articles in the same issue include "Indian History," by Dr. V. A. Smith; "How to Mitigate the Evils of Examinations," by Prof. C. A. Firth; and historical revisions, "The Battle of Flores, 1591," by G. Callender.

"The Company of Royal Adventurers Trading into Africa" is the title of a study by Prof. George F. Zook. The company of traders whose history is sketched in this pamphlet was organized in order to obtain for England a share in the trade in African negro slaves. The entrance of the company into this region led to difficulties with the Dutch. The company passed into financial ruin, and it was shortly afterwards succeeded by the far more powerful Royal African Company. Professor Zook promises a study of the activities of the later company in the near future.

Books upon reconstruction published before the summer of 1918 are illustrated and annotated by A. G. S. Josephson, of the John Crerar Library in Bulletin No. 2 of the E. H. Gary Library of Law of the Northwestern University Law School of Chicago.

A second revised edition of "A Syllabus of United States History 1492 to 1919," by Profs. H. C. Hockett and A. M. Schlesinger, has appeared.

"Salmon Portland Chase: Undergraduate and Pedagogue" is the title of a study by Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger. The paper is composed mainly of letters from Chase describing his college life and his early teaching experience.

"Stories of Great Heroes," by the Rev. James Higgins, contains brief, simple biographies of seventeen discoverers, explorers and Christianizers of America. The characters chosen, with the exception of Sir Francis Drake, were all members of the Roman Catholic Church, and the book, bearing the imprimatur of the archbishop of Boston, is evidently designed for use in Catholic schools. (Macmillan Company, publishers.)

Periodical Literature

BY GERTRUDE BRAMLETTE RICHARDS, PH.D.

The analysis and criticism of the Plumb plan and the railways (*Review of Reviews* for September) will be read with interest by those who are interested in the question of the disposition of our railways.

In the *Rivista d'Italia*, Signor F. de Chaurand discusses the difficulties threatening the problem of disarmament. On the whole, the author feels the time is not ripe for laying down arms.

The National Geographic Magazine for September publishes, with excellent illustrations, Charles K. Edmund's "Shantung—China's Holy Land," and "The Descendants of Confucius—Toilers of Shantung," by Maynard Owen Williams.

"With unemployment already numbering about half a million; with the prospect of far increasing unemployment when another two and a half million soldiers are discharged; with the spectre of wholesale unemployment if our factories have to stop because of the lack of coal and raw materials, Italy must see her workmen shut out from the United States by the general impending veto against immigration for several years; from France by the failure to obtain for our workmen the recognition of fair treatment already alluded to; from Central Europe for obvious reasons; from South America for lack of tonnage and local crises" is the summary of "Italy's Economic Crisis" by Dr. Giovanni Pioli (*Contemporary Review* for September).

"Labour and the State," by Prof. J. B. Firth (*Fortnightly Review* for August), is a study of the relation of labor conditions in England with those of other lands. Regarding the attitude of labor, Mr. Firth says: "The Trade Unions contrive to practice a very complete system of tyranny. Industrial freedom does not exist in England today. . . . More and more each skilled trade is becoming a close corporation, and the more important the machine becomes compared with the man who minds it, the closer the members of the Union strive to make the corporation to which they belong and the more jealously they guard the doors of entrance."

In "The Fortunes of Egypt" (*Nineteenth Century* for August) Dr. A. J. Butler points out "that government must come before self-government. And it must be a systematic government, British government with real and full executive power entrusted to British officials directly responsible to a British central authority. The protectorate now established must justify itself by sweeping away the crumbling fictions on which too much of our administration has hitherto rested. A really strong and just government is the first necessity. With that, and with the good-will of the people, progress and ultimate self-government may be achieved."

"The League of Insincerity," by David Jayne Hill, in the *North American Review* for September, is an addition to the controversial literature now so abundant on the League of Nations. Mr. Hill emphasizes particularly the dangers from too careless a construction of clauses in Articles X and XXI. In the same magazine Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks says, in his article, "Japan in Action": "The Japanese policy in China has been clearly to keep conditions unsettled by fomenting disturbances and hostilities between the so-called North and South factions and to keep China weak."

An Open Letter from the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship

September 20, 1919.

Editor THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK:

In accordance with plans outlined by the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools at the Washington meeting, May 30 and June 1, I devoted the month of July to the pleasant task of presenting the results of our several conferences to gatherings of teachers at university summer schools. The institutions visited and the dates of lectures were as follows: The University of Illinois, July 1 and July 2; the University of Kansas, July 7; the University of Nebraska, July 8; the University of South Dakota, July 10; the University of Wisconsin, July 14; and the University of Chicago, July 16. On the trip to the far west following the Chicago meeting, I spoke at two of the South Dakota normal schools, Madison and Aberdeen; at the University of Montana, July 25; at the Portland Extension Summer School of the University of Oregon, July 28; and at the University of Oregon Summer School, July 30.

The audiences addressed in all cases were composed of teachers, and in the cases of the larger universities visited they were for the most part teachers of history, with a sprinkling of principals and superintendents. In consequence of this limitation, the audiences were not usually large, although several times the numbers ran up to four hundred or five hundred persons. Interest everywhere was keen, showing that teachers are concerned about the problem which our committee has under consideration.

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT.

After introducing the committee's report with an introductory account of the influence which national committees have had upon the subject of history teaching, beginning with the Committee of Ten in 1892, I discussed the report of our present committee under three heads: (1) The plan; (2) the method; (3) the content. I pointed out that the plan involved the preparation of three groups of history courses. The first group, adapted to the needs of the first six grades, is to deal with (a) the local community; (b) the making of the United States; (c) how we are governed. To put it in another way, we are providing a series of courses, beginning with the second grade, which will enable pupils to complete by the end of the sixth grade one full round of elementary American history, with government. The second group of courses will be on the theme, "American History in its World Setting." This group will comprise three years' work and will be administered in the seventh, eighth and ninth years, which corresponds to the junior high school period. The third group will be on the theme, "The Modern World." This will comprise work for the three years of the senior high

school and will embrace modern world history in the tenth grade, American history from the beginning of the national period in the eleventh grade, and social science in the twelfth grade. I always took care to indicate that where the eight-four plan of organization prevails a modification could easily be made by which the work planned for the ninth grade might be given in grade eight and a preliminary course in ancient and medieval and early modern history could go into the ninth grade.

In discussing the subject of method, two special points were emphasized. In the first place, it was shown that the proposed courses for grades two to six would claim only two hours per week of the pupils' time in those years. In those two hours, however, it was the design to proceed by a method much more strictly historical than that usually employed with young children. In the first place, the point of beginning being the local community, elements of whose life are directly observable by the children, it would be the aim to establish in the minds of children during the first year of history work a number of principles which would assist toward the interpretation of the more general phases of American history. For instance, as Doctor Johnson points out, the pupils will very promptly be brought into contact with the idea of a primitive life at the basis of the community history. They will learn something about the Indians, who they were, how they lived, and what they said about themselves. They will learn about the effects of the contact between whites and Indians. They will learn about the usual order in which hunters and trappers, backwoods farmers, the more permanent class of farmers, the builders of mills, the merchants and other business men came into the life of a typical community. They will note the course of community development through transportation facilities, agriculture, commerce, manufacturing, etc. They will also, in this first year's work, according to Doctor Johnson's plan, learn in an elementary way to discriminate among kinds of historical evidence.

These interpretative ideas will then be employed in the study of the topic, "How Europe found America and what she did with it," in the fourth grade; "How Englishmen became Americans," in the fifth grade; and "How America became what it is to-day in its development and in its government," in the sixth grade. The same principles, vitalized through application to ever wider and more complex historical interests, would be employed as the pupil climbs from grade to grade through the junior high school and the senior high school.

The second main point, under the subject of method, was the disposition of the committee to place more than the usual emphasis, in the earlier grades,

upon the economic and social phases of history. This would not exclude a proper development of the outlines of political history, the aim being to render the work more vitally interesting to children by enlarging upon those phases of the story which will help them to reconstruct the life as it was in the period studied. Of course, much biographical and other story material would necessarily be used in developing the outline of work in the two hours per week of the first six grades, and the committee hoped that some additional time might be given to the rudimentary forms of civics instruction also. With the greater maturity attained by pupils as they reach the senior high school, the method naturally changes in a way to bring the emphasis upon political organization and political movements.

On the subject of content, I epitomized the entire course as an attempt to provide in the first six years a minimum of instruction in American history looked at from the standpoint of citizenship; in the junior high school to familiarize the pupil with the general course of world affairs, placing the United States in the perspective of world history. The senior high school pupils, it was pointed out, were comparatively mature and their education was designed to place them at graduation on a somewhat exalted plane of citizenship training. The emphasis upon the modern world in the three years of the senior high school, therefore, was logical as affording an opportunity for the more intensive study of the problems of to-day, whose roots are to be found mainly in the history of the last three hundred years. The point was usually made that the junior high school period represents the age at which pupils manifest the greatest eagerness and curiosity to learn about everything everywhere; that professional educationalists are pointing out the importance of removing space and time limitations, so far as possible, at this age, and letting the pupil acquire the full use of his imagination. In studying science, the whole world of science should be his theme, and if he is studying history, the theme should be the whole world of social life.

A general argument for the introduction of a more thoroughly systematized course in history and social science was based upon the need of the new time, with its insistent demand for a wider outlook upon world affairs as a preparation for American citizenship. The vocational argument, I told my audiences, is today a very effective one. But the word *vocation* as ordinarily used refers to this group or that group only. There is one vocation which is universal, the vocation of citizenship. On that argument, I believe, teachers could approach the American public with confidence and demand from it adequate provision for instruction for our children in history and the allied social sciences.

THE RESPONSE.

On taking a general view of my experience on this lecture tour, I am convinced that the committee's project is destined to meet with a large measure of favor. Teachers are generally ready to accept the

view that more and more definite instruction must be given pupils in view of the extremely critical citizenship demands. The division between the teaching of history and the teaching of citizenship which is so noticeable in some of the eastern cities did not appear prominently at any of my meetings. It seemed to me that the teachers throughout the Middle West and the West were disposed to look upon the two lines of teaching, so far at least as the schools below the senior high school are concerned, as merely phases of the same subject. There was, however, great interest manifested in the plan for a ninth grade course which, with a historical basis, should focalize upon civic problems, and in the capstone course in social science suggested by our committee. I heard no suggestion anywhere that history and civics in the lower grades and the junior high school must be taught by separate teachers, or even that the social science work of the high school could not very properly be taught by history teachers, *if they were trained in social science*.

Respecting the three distinct divisions of the committee's program, I have a clear impression that the suggested course for the junior high school meets with the most general favor. There are a good many queries about the senior high school work. Some teachers, as was to be expected, insist on the necessity of a ninth grade course in the history of civilization, bringing the story up into the modern time. Otherwise, these teachers contend, the course in modern world history for the tenth grade will have nothing to stand upon. Having no experience of what might be done in the way of teaching world history to pupils of the seventh and eighth grades, these teachers assume that pupils will reach the first year of the four years' high school course as ignorant of world history as they have been in the past. Moreover, they overlook the fact that under our plan there would be but one year intervening between the completion of the junior high school course in general history and what would necessarily be a review of much of the same material in the ninth grade, if ancient and medieval history were given in that grade. Some, however, justified their position on the theory that general history cannot be taught to seventh grade and eighth grade pupils.

Here again, no doubt, we are dealing with the dead hand of tradition. Under the plan outlined by the Committee of Eight, it has been found that pupils of the sixth grade can learn, in an elementary way, the story of the world prior to the discovery of America. Doubtless the remainder of world history could likewise be learned in the seventh grade provided it were presented in simple and direct and, so far as possible, concrete forms, and in language adapted to pupils of that age. I encountered some criticism on each one of the three courses designed for the senior high school, but the amount of disagreement with the committee in that portion of the report was comparatively small.

It is the work of the first six grades which meets with the most serious opposition. This, however, is not surprising in view of the wide divergence be-

tween the plan outlined by Doctor Johnson and accepted by the committee and the plans which have hitherto obtained with reference to the elementary grades. Many teachers refuse to believe that young children can be taught by the historical method. After my departure the head of the history department at one of the universities visited wrote me as follows:

"I heard a lot of kicking on your elementary school program from the teachers. I only wish they had spoken out in meeting as they talked to me afterwards. They claim that the psychology of the program is all wrong; that the last thing in which you can interest the child is his environment; and that the things that have happened are the things in which he is interested."

A history professor in another of the prominent universities contends that the committee is all wrong in assuming that American history and government can be taught to children as early as the sixth grade. He combats the argument for a complete round of history, with civics, in the first six grades, which is based on the statistics of mortality. If the pupils to the extent of fifty per cent. drop out of school by the end of the sixth grade, he says, let us appeal to the legislatures for laws preventing it. Let us by no means accept an alleged condition which is dependent upon legislative action as a basis for an organization of history work which after all is not justified by psychology and experience. He says:

"But experience does not warrant this expectation that by the end of the sixth grade there can possibly be inculcated an understanding of history sufficient to be an adequate foundation for intelligent and responsible citizenship. . . . These pupils must be kept by law in the schools till they are capable of learning in the sense of comprehending, and this degree of power of comprehending is not attained by most children before the eighth grade. It seems to me, therefore, that it is in this grade, as the Committee of Eight recommended, that the most important elements of American history should come."

The above quotations are thoroughly typical of comments heard all along the route. Some of the committee's best friends and helpers voiced their doubts about the practicability of the work for the first six years.

My answer invariably was, in effect: What man has done, man can do. I pointed out that Doctor Johnson, in a varied experience covering twenty-five years, had fully demonstrated the practicability and the advantage of his proposed plan of procedure. It is therefore all a question of generalizing his results through the presentation of a detailed methodology. This leads me to remark that the most critical practical problem that the committee has before it right now is to get ready to present to the country the detailed syllabus for the first six grades which Doctor Johnson was kind enough to promise us. If that syllabus could by any chance be prepared and printed in the *Outlook* several months before the publication of the general report, teachers would have an op-

portunity to examine it, and thus, no doubt, be the better prepared to welcome the report as a whole.

In the last quotation it appears that the writer minimizes the "American history in its world setting," which will be the theme of Grades 7 and 8, supplemented by a large amount of recent social and economic history, with civics, in Grade 9. It is at least open to question whether this will not constitute a better training for citizenship than is secured now with European backgrounds in Grade 6 and American history in Grades 7 and 8.

One group of questions which I encountered (particularly at Chicago University) had reference to tests for determining the inclusion or exclusion of material. A number of men in and about Chicago are profoundly interested in this question of tests, and they are doing some most excellent investigative work along that line. Such work appears to me to promise for history benefits similar to those conferred upon other school subjects by standard tests. It seemed to me, however, that there is a temptation in some cases to ignore certain factors of the problem of history teaching, or at least to lay undue emphasis upon certain phases, thus discriminating against others by comparison.

The tendency seems to be to argue as follows: Some things learned in the history courses are obviously useful to the pupil, who learns them on account of their relation to life outside of the school. Many other things customarily learned in the history courses, as traditionally taught, never emerge as factors in everyday thinking. Since the time for history is necessarily limited, and since there is an abundance of material of the useful kind, why should the history course, as outlined, compel the pupil to learn a vast number of things which are simply forgotten after the recitation or the examination?

Personally, I have much sympathy with this point of view. My only fear is that too narrow an interpretation is being given to the term "useful." History, as I pointed out in the discussion following the Chicago lecture, where these questions were raised in very intelligent fashion, is *the biology of the social sciences*.

A great deal of material necessarily learned in the history course has reference not to matters that could be catalogued as useful socially because of the statistical demonstration that they are much on men's tongues or that they serve as important elements in practical everyday thinking. Essentially, the history course, regarded as a whole, must interpret to the child, one after another, the evolving institutions of society in order that, on emerging into our own times, he may understand what must be regarded for the present as the more perfect forms; at least, they are the forms we have to deal with until they are changed and our study of their development will help toward securing wise changes. Obviously, a very large proportion of the facts needed in this progressive interpretation of world life will not be useful on the plane of present-day American society. But they have all

been useful for the purpose of making available the things that we now regard as useful. If the test-makers will turn their attention sharply to the question of eliminating facts which have no value in *teaching the things which we regard as essential*, they will perform a valuable service to history teaching.

Touching the question of whether or not the study of history would necessarily develop the historical attitude of mind and that this would lead to better citizenship, I was asked the question, "Is this assumption based on fact? Are the historians better citizens than our scientists, lawyers, doctors, or teachers and professors at large?" The answer is: If by "better citizens" the interrogator means more intelligent, wiser citizens, I would answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Every one of the classes mentioned in the above catalogue of educated men can, of course, exhibit representatives who are thoroughly competent to handle public questions as citizens. But in these cases the individuals have given themselves special training along historical, political, economic and sociological lines. In this discussion we are considering the general question of *training persons in the schools for the universal vocation of citizenship*. The very considerable group of those who have given themselves proper training *outside of the schools* does not here properly concern us.

THE OUTLOOK—POINTS TO CONSIDER.

In conclusion, I am encouraged in believing that the committee is on the right track. At its forthcoming meeting in Cleveland, in connection with the American Historical Association meeting, the committee will need to consider all of the main criticisms passed upon the projected course of study. It will be necessary also to adopt a very definite proposal for the eight-four plan of organization as distinguished from

the six-three plan; and in addition something must be done for the rural schools. One of our critics says:

"The committee seems to ignore the fact that in the Middle West a large percentage of the pupils are taught in the rural districts where one teacher handles all the work of the first eight grades. It is impossible for her to have the time or the training to work out a 'simple but connected story' of the community or of the United States. She will have to depend upon your syllabus or a text-book to do this for her, and it is not clear to me how either of these can do this."

One of the leading American experts on rural school education, now the president of an important normal school where the training of rural teachers is emphasized, points out that what the rural schools will require is one or two textbooks embodying so much of the elementary and junior high school work as can be taught to these pupils in two or three years. This specialist has promised the committee the fullest cooperation in working out the rural school course.

At the opposite end of the scale from the rural school is the strong, well organized city high school. There is much sentiment in favor of a plan, already several times suggested in the committee itself, for suggesting a considerable range of history courses to be elected by such high schools. In other words, the committee's proposed two-year senior high school course in history, with the capstone course in social science, should be considered a *minimum requirement* so far as history is concerned.

JOSEPH SCHAFER,

Chairman of the Committee on History and
Education for Citizenship.

A Course in World History¹

BY PROFESSOR CALVIN O. DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

Nothing is more certain than that any spirit of provincialism and aloofness which may have characterized America as a nation five years ago has either wholly disappeared, or else to-day is in the process of rapid disappearance.

The world war has made us internationalists in interests and relationships. Whether we will or not, we must in the future take full cognizance of the ambitions, plans, and activities of all peoples of the civilized world. Whether we formally subscribe to a League of Nations and officially enroll ourselves as one of its members or not (and for my part it seems the height of wisdom to do both), the United States is destined to be a dominant factor in shaping world politics and in administering world problems of all kinds. If we *shall* not do this, we shall miss a most remarkable opportunity for rendering human service;

if we *will* not do this, we shall bring down upon our heads the charge of callous selfishness and deliberate obstructiveness. Indeed, should we fail at this time to accept the new responsibilities which have been thrust upon us by the events of the war, we could find little to justify our entrance upon the great struggle in the first place, and little to excuse our self-laudations respecting altruistic motives in our recent military dealings with foreign peoples.

The American nation to-day is most certainly a world nation. Indeed, it is doubtless proper to say, it is the leading world nation—the nation with the greatest world prestige, the greatest prosperity, the greatest promise for the future. Whatever shall be the terms of settlement at the Peace Conference, for years to come (possibly for centuries to come) America, it seems probable, will be called upon to stabilize, guide and direct the activities of less fortunate and weaker nations of the world. Our democracy is the oldest, the strongest, the best organized, and the

¹ An address delivered before the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club at Ann Arbor, Mich., April 3, 1919.

freest from radicalism of any of the self-governing nations of the world. Our governmental forms and practices have become the revered ideals of millions of less favored people. Our fraternal advice is being sought and our generous co-operation is expected. We are to-day, in a very literal sense, our weaker brother's keeper. Yes, more, we are coming very near to being the keeper of the fates of the entire family of nations.

In order to meet the obligations which the times have laid upon us, and in order to prove ourselves good Samaritans to our neighbors who have, in so many cases recently, been misled, mistreated and abandoned, it is, of course, imperative that America shall know intimately what interests sway, what ideals guide, what prejudices warp, what customs dominate, and what institutions represent human beings in other parts of the world than our own. But the current needs do not end there. In order to become the wise counsellor and the efficient benefactor which the circumstances require, it is necessary that America shall also be acquainted with the origin, development, and significance of the various social forces which have operated to produce the situations of to-day—shall, indeed, be conversant with the history of the several peoples with whom it is henceforth to be associated. For, certainly, friendly intercourse depends upon mutual respect, mutual toleration, and mutual trust, and these qualities can, in turn, be gained only through a common understanding of the ideas, motives and feelings which actuate people.

The foregoing considerations relate primarily to the political affairs of the world. Precisely the same principles govern, however, when other types of world problems are taken into account. It seems certain, for example, that henceforth America is to be brought into industrial and commercial contact with quarters of the globe hitherto little recognized by us, and will carry forward trade relations, with all peoples, on a scale and in a manner never hitherto dreamed of. In consequence, a spirit of mutual good-will must be developed and perpetuated in all relationships, and this, we cannot help but believe, will be fostered by a knowledge of the industrial life of the various nations within the circle of our interests—a knowledge of the commodities suitable for exchange, the processes of their production and transportation, and the human elements of labor and control which enter into the products. Nor can such trade conditions be rightfully understood, articulated and utilized except as the historical backgrounds of these conditions are analyzed and known.

Thirdly, the demands of culture itself tend to make it necessary for Americans of to-day and to-morrow to be somewhat intimately acquainted with the geography, material resources, life, literature and institutions of many nations and peoples who hitherto have stood in no very close relationship to the modern world of progress. Until recently few of the more obscure nations of the world have had much to contribute to the cause of culture. This, at least in many instances, can no longer be the case. Even the

smallest, if they continue to meet around the council table of the allied nations, will, *ipso facto*, have claims to cultural recognition. Their philosophies, however crude; their languages and literatures, however inferior; their histories, however brief; their arts and sciences, however few, have, nevertheless, to-day all been turned into the great common stream of civilization, and will, therefore, inevitably (at least in a small way) tend to color its current. No one who is searching for the entire truth, for all the facts which enter into present-day problems, can consistently refuse to trace back to their sources the new rivulets which are thus bringing down to the main stream valuable, though small, deposits.

All these considerations seem to suggest the need, if not indeed the necessity, of providing in our public schools courses which shall acquaint our youths with the significant forces and factors which are operating among the various peoples of the globe with whom we as a nation are likely to have social and economic intercourse. Let it be granted at once that some courses of this kind are to be found in our secondary schools and colleges at present. Many of the courses in language, literature, geography, and history would fall under this classification. But in most schools, these courses do not suffice. They are, for the most part, too detailed and specialized, and too limited in range to meet the needs of any pupils except those who are so situated and so disposed as to have guaranteed for them a rather prolonged period of schooling. Such courses fail to take due account of the fact that large numbers of our youths must, perforce, cut their school days considerably short of the full twelve or sixteen years which are available for the more fortunate classes. When it is remembered that only about thirty per cent. of all pupils who enter the first grade of our public school system ever continue in the schools until the ninth grade is reached, and that fewer than forty per cent. of those who do enter the high school continue long enough to graduate therefrom,² it is obvious that not all the work should be planned solely with regard to those who are destined to have a long school career ahead of them.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that America is ruled by *all* its people. Therefore the opinions and attitudes of the large body of imperfectly instructed individuals is likely to outweigh, in practical influence, the more studied judgments of highly educated persons. It does not suffice, therefore, from the standpoint of civic and social advantage to train the few somewhat extensively concerning matters of public interest and to leave the many in more or less ignorance respecting them. For the former group, doubtless, several rather highly differentiated courses of study in most of the subjects now offered in the high school are justifiable and desirable; for the latter group, it is equally clear, fundamental, introductory and general courses giving a survey of the entire field of common knowledge are needed.

² U. S. Com. of Ed. Report, Vol. II, 1917, p. 8.

There is another consideration which starts from a different base, but leads to the same conclusion. This is the question of pedagogical treatment. Altogether too many plans of organization of school work are open to severe criticism on this score. Too frequently the offerings within a given department consist of several courses, each dealing with a relatively intensive study of a limited portion of the subject, without having given an opportunity for the pupil to gain a general framework of the facts and principles upon which to hang the more advanced specialized and detailed knowledge. Nor is provision often adequately made in our schools for giving pupils sufficient exercise in the fundamental intellectual powers and processes involved in the study, before exacting of them independent, unguided, and unsupervised responses and judgments.

While the above considerations, if accepted in principle, might apply equally validly to almost all departments of learning usually found in the curriculum of our public secondary schools, it is of course to the organization and administration of the work in history that we are here directing particular attention. In order, therefore, to meet the contemporary civic, social, economic and cultural demands of the times, to take into particular account the interests of pupils whose stay in the schools is not to be lengthy, and to conform to the best ideals of pedagogy, I move that there be introduced into our public schools immediately a course in world history.

In proposing the reform, I am not unmindful of the fact that once upon a time—and not so many years ago—a course in general history of the world did occupy a conspicuous place in most secondary schools of the country. I am fully aware, too, of the disrepute into which this course later fell. I frankly acknowledge that in many cases (possibly in most instances) it consisted of a hodge-podge of insignificant facts, insignificantly presented. I realize that it was finally eliminated root and branch, and the space which it once occupied has since been so covered that few, if any, of the later generation of school pupils know of its former existence.

Nevertheless, to my mind, the fault of the old course in general history lay not in its conception of plan, but in the detailed organization and execution of the plan. If, as is often alleged, the course in general history was weak (in that it was superficial and encyclopædic in character) that was a mistake chargeable on one side of the account; if existing courses in history in the high school are too analytical and detailed, that is an indictment chargeable on the other column of the ledger. Is not wisdom to be found in a compromise plan? Does not the best arrangement lie between the extremes? At any rate, we do not today in most departments in the universities proceed in the manner in which the high schools are proceeding. Quite the reverse. In the universities introductory or general courses in philosophy precede all specialized courses in that branch of learning. In English literature a course which sketches the situation throughout the entire period of English national life

is presented before the intensified courses dealing with particular epochs are pursued. In sociology and economics the beginning courses which lay broad foundations are prerequisite to more specialized courses.

Why it should be deemed less desirable, pedagogical or profitable to make the approach to new fields of knowledge in the high school in a similar manner is not clear. As matters stand to-day ancient history with its emphasis upon constitutional and governmental forms and practices confronts the boys and girls in the ninth grade, and so-called medieval and modern European history, with stress upon reigning houses, military struggles, and political issues, occupies the mind of the second year student. Observations of schools seem to lead to the conviction that both of these courses are, for large numbers of pupils, wholly unappealing. The cause is not difficult to find. It is that the young people pursuing them have no adequate social background which will enable them to interpret the recorded facts. What is needed by them is a simpler, more general introduction to *the world as remade by man*. A course in world history, discriminatively organized and concretely taught, would tend to circumvent most of the objections and weaknesses inherent in the present arrangement of courses, and would, at the same time, afford positive advantages of its own.

Such a course should, to my mind, be the first course in history open to pupils in the ninth grade, and should be prescribed for all. After the pupils have gained a knowledge of the larger currents of human activities, then they can properly be directed to a more detailed and specialized study of the various contributing forces.

A course of this kind should concern itself with the origin and development of human forces which are at the present moment conspicuously affecting mankind in America. In particular the rise and growth of democratic principles and practices should be stressed. Not that wars and political struggles and changes should monopolize the time. Quite the opposite. But the social conditions which gave birth to these should be emphasized—the customs, morals, arts and aspirations of the common people, as well as the doings of the privileged classes. Above all, a course of this kind should seek to bring out the *beneficent, righteous and wholesome* interests and efforts of the human race, and not (as has too often been the practice in the past) to dwell on the sordid, selfish and seamy side of life. It may not be good advice to urge that we constantly “turn the dark clouds inside out and smile, smile, smile,” but it likewise is not good advice to advocate that youths in the impressionable years of adolescence shall be exposed over-much to the loathsome diseases of the past—particularly if those diseases have been brought under social control and are no longer likely to prove menaces. It is good psychology and good pedagogy to present to the learner positive rather than negative suggestions.

In organizing a course such as I have in mind, it is not necessary that the order of arrangement shall be strictly chronological. Indeed, the counter-chronological plan has much to be said in its favor. In fact, the Great War might very properly be the point of beginning and of departure, and be made the center of reference for the entire course. Every youth of the land is already familiar with the main events which have grouped themselves about this gigantic struggle during the past five years. His interests, it is safe to say, would need no artificial stimulation. They are already aroused. He therefore has even now a considerable background of social experience and a considerable fund of practical historical knowledge which would serve mightily in helping to integrate and interpret the issues of the period. What he lacks is a systematic approach to the whole group of problems involved, a comprehensive outlook upon the past, and an adequate knowledge of the deeper causes which led up to the cataclysm.

Any course which should make the Great War the core of its work might, it is true, find it desirable, if not necessary, at least to sketch the national development of each of the states which ultimately found themselves drawn into the struggle. This, however, is precisely the thing that is desired. To follow such a plan would give a complete survey of world history and yet would afford the double advantage of starting with familiar facts and culminating in contemporary problems. In the manner of the shuttle in the loom, this scheme would permit the playing back and forth of the thread of the discussion between the present and the past, call for the comparison of the conditions of to-day with those of yesterday, and lead to the noting of conspicuous changes in human relationships and the discovery of the causes which have produced them. The method thus employed would be a composite of the retrospective arrangement advocated so extensively sixty years ago, and the essential features of the "concentric circle" or "spiral" plan so effectively used in certain countries of the globe to-day.

Precisely what shall be the detailed content of a course such as I am here advocating, the limits of space at our disposal will not permit of sketching. It should, however, as I have already suggested, reveal to our youths something more than the military and political changes which are affecting the various peoples of the world, however important these aspects of history and sociology are. It should, most emphatically and most assuredly it seems to me, be intimately interwoven with a study of the geography of the world. As Professor Henry Johnson so well phrases it: "The theater of events is a necessary part of their reality. It is in many cases the cause that produces them. Man makes his physical environment. The story of his life is in any case inseparable from his physical environment. Geography describes this environment. It must, in describing it, include the works of man. History without geography and geography without history are alike unthinkable—European experience seems to indicate that the place

to emphasize the geographical background of history is in the history course.³

And again, as Prof. R. H. Whitbeck expresses it: "In the training of citizens for a democracy there are four lines of study that go hand in hand in making broad-minded citizens—economics, history, political science, and geography. I am thinking of geography in its broad sense—the kind of geography that makes men well informed about the nations of the world, which makes them intelligent about other peoples, about their aptitudes, their forms of government, their social institutions, their national likes and dislikes, their military and naval strength, their reserves of coal, iron, copper, and petroleum, the character of their climate, of their harbors, and of their transportation systems. I cannot escape the conviction that education which does this for our young men and women is one kind of education that our nation at this age demands. It is training for citizenship in the broadest sense of the word, not only for performing the duties of a citizen at home, but for *guiding* safely the nation in its international relations. It forms a background for intelligent action, it enables people to read more intelligently, to converse and to write and to think more intelligently."⁴

If the criticism be raised that a course of this kind is not history but geography, the reply is: All depends on definitions and upon how restrictedly lines are drawn. Surely when one considers the inseparable relationship between the two fields, and further contemplates the fact that all formal geography study stops in our primary schools usually at the middle of the seventh grade, that the only course in history taught in our elementary schools is one in United States history, that the high school provides no general course in geography for any students—surely when one considers these facts the need for an introductory course in historical-geographical material, offered at the outset of the secondary school curriculum becomes almost imperative.

Let us, therefore, lend our support to the organization of a new course in social science for our high schools. Let us include in it the larger and more significant questions of geography, sociology, economics, current events and political sciences. Let us correlate and integrate these topics firmly with the historical events which explain them. Let us call such a course world history, introductory sociology, general geography, or what you will, but let us have a course of this kind, under some title, available at the outset for every boy and girl who enters the ninth grade.

The *Forum* for August publishes a special account of the Ford trial—"Henry Ford at Bay"—and also an interesting article by H. deWissen, "The Mystery of the Czarina," in which the author explains the mystery by saying that the Empress was "drugged by the mysticism which touches all not born in the land."

³ "The Teaching of History," pp. 394-397.

⁴ "School and Society," Vol. LX, No. 217, February 22, 1919, p. 227.

Helping the Elementary History Teacher

BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, PHILADELPHIA.

The questions given below were prepared for the elementary public schools of Philadelphia by the Department of Superintendence, not with a view to testing the pupils, but rather as standardization tests, with the object of directing the teaching into what is believed to be the proper method.

The course of study in history in Philadelphia follows in general the course as formulated by the Committee of Eight of the American Historical Association. In Grades One and Two, the place of history is filled by the formal observance of national holidays and anniversaries, such as Washington's Birthday and Memorial Day. As a concession, perhaps, to social history, stories of Indian life, as an example of a primitive society, are included. Observance of Hallowe'en as typical of the harvest festival is suggested, but not required. The celebration of a spring festival, on May Day, is part of the course.

The work in Grade Three includes stories, told by the teacher, of the great national heroes of all countries, ranging from mythological or legendary personages like Siegfried or Roland, to those for whose existence and deeds we have better evidence, such as Alexander, Joan of Arc, and Florence Nightingale. The observance of holidays is continued with the addition of Penn Day, Columbus Day, and Thanksgiving Day.

In these three grades the children learn the meaning of the various festivals, and become interested in heroes of the ancient and modern world. The course specifically sets forth the particular incidents in the career of each that it is desired to emphasize. These incidents have always either an implication of a fulfilled duty or else emphasize some civic virtue. The story of Cincinnatus leaving the plow to lead the armies of his country illustrates the first, and the stories of Richard, the Lion-hearted, and Saladin, as an example of knightly courtesy, and of Richard and Blondin, as an example of steadfast loyalty and friendship, illustrate the second of these two aims.

In the Fourth and Fifth Years the history of our own country is taken up in the form of biographical narrative. The first half of the Fourth Year includes stories of the explorers, the settlers in the south, and the settlers in New England. In the second half of the Fourth Year especial attention is given to the early history of Pennsylvania and of Pennsylvania's neighbors. The last few weeks of this term are devoted to stories of life in the colonies, associating these with Philadelphia and Pennsylvania wherever possible.

In all the work of this year the stories are told through the lives of such personages as Captain John Smith, Miles Standish, Massasoit, and William Penn, endeavoring thus to reach the minds of the children through their interest in people.

The work in Grade Five covers the history of our country, almost wholly through biographical narrative, from Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Adams down to Theodore Roosevelt. No living person is included. The object of the work here is to lead "the children to a keen appreciation of American ideals as presented in the lives of the nation's builders, and so stimulating them to an emulation of such American leadership." The procedure suggested is for the teacher to tell the story before referring the children to a book or historical reader, and to tell it in the same interested way that one would talk about a personal acquaintance, the idea being to bring to the consciousness of the pupils the belief that these men and women had the same humanity as the men and women they see about them. Conspicuous virtues are not especially to be dwelt upon, but emphasis is placed upon actions that illustrate those traits. No written notes or summaries, or tests are to be required, but oral re-telling of the story is encouraged. Dramatization is here, as in the earlier grades, relied on as a means of expression likely to arouse a keen interest in the stories on the part of the children.

In Grade Six, the course follows closely the report of the Committee of Eight, but in the teaching, constant endeavor is made to relate the old world story to the life and civilization of to-day. In this grade, the written reproduction of the lessons may be required and the pupils are trained in the making of simple outlines, and urged to compile illustrated notebooks. The first few lessons in this grade are devoted to the discussion of dates and their meaning.

In Grades Seven and Eight the history of the United States is taken up formally, commencing with the founding of Jamestown in 1607, the work in the Sixth Year having included the stories of the discoverers and the early explorations. In these grades, as in Grade Six, it is endeavored to tie up the history of our country with its present development, and to look upon our present ideals, and customs, and laws, as the fulfillment to date of those which from time to time have appeared during our development as a nation. There is a list of about a dozen dates that the pupils of Grades Seven and Eight are expected to know.

There are a few rather important departures from the course suggested by the Committee of Eight. In the first place, the law of Pennsylvania requires that the history of the state shall be taught. The committee that made the course of study have met that provision by expanding the colonial history of Pennsylvania where it is reached at its logical place in pre-Revolutionary history. Life in Pennsylvania is treated as being typical of colonial and pioneer life in general. At the same time differences of custom among the colonies are touched upon. Events in post-

Revolutionary history with which Pennsylvania was connected are not over-emphasized, but the fact of Pennsylvania's part in them is always mentioned.

In Grade Five, the stories of the lives of a number of historical personages of minor importance, whose influence was chiefly local to New England, have been omitted, and stories of prominent Pennsylvanians have been inserted in their place.

The work of Grades Seven and Eight is divided at 1815 instead of 1789. This division gives more time for our more recent history. In the last half of Grade Eight, one period a week is devoted to current history.

The questions for Grades One to Five are intended as supervisory questions, which suggest to the teacher answering them methods of teaching, results that might reasonably be expected as an outcome of successful presentation, or sources of information for local history. The questions on the three upper grades cover topics that, according to the schedule of lessons given in the course, should be completed shortly after October 15. These questions and answers were distributed at the beginning of the term with the thought that the teacher would use such methods and subject matter in the presentation of the topics as would result in answers by the pupils approximating those given.

Since the Philadelphia schools have what is called an open text-book list the source selections to be outlined, given in Grades Seven and Eight, were chosen principally to avoid selecting paragraphs from history text-books, and not because it was felt that extracts from sources should be the only, or even a frequently used, basis for the making of outlines.

It was also found that the text-books varied considerably in their analysis of the Monroe Doctrine. It was deemed wise, therefore, to insert in the answer to the question concerning the Monroe Doctrine in the questions for Grade Eight the extracts from Monroe's message as a justification for the analysis as given. The pupils are, of course, not expected to make the extracts a part of their answer.

The explanatory paragraph preceding the questions for Grades One, Two and Three was repeated for Grades Four and Five. Those preceding the questions and answers for Grade Six were repeated for Grades Seven and Eight.

QUESTIONS FOR TEACHERS.

HISTORY.

(GRADES ONE, TWO, THREE).

(NOTE.—The purpose of the following questions is to focus the attention of teachers upon some of the more fundamental aspects of the course in history. It is not the intention that teachers shall answer the questions formally or in writing. In every school arrangements should be made for discussion of the topics indicated, either in regular meetings, or, if preferred, more informally.)

1. Which of the historical stories listed for your grade were familiar to some of your pupils before your telling? Were you able to ascertain the source of their knowledge of these stories?

2. Have you had the children reproduce by means of a picture or a series of pictures a story you have told?
3. Do you find that children in their play spontaneously impersonate characters of whom they have been told in the history period? Do they spontaneously dramatize historic incidents of which they have learned?
4. Are your pupils sensitive to the difference between fairy tales and stories from history? How do you bring your pupils to realize that the stories told in the history period "really happened?"
5. Do you succeed through your history lessons in developing in your pupils a sense of the long ago?

(GRADE FOUR.)

1. In connection with local history, what have you done to associate places of historic importance, streets, names, etc., with the events of the past?
2. In your teaching do you constantly compare the past with the present in regard to ways of living, ease of communication, and other social conditions where the changes have been noteworthy?
3. Have you found it possible to take your class on excursions to places of historic importance?
4. Do you ever have children bring relics of the past to school, or have them tell in their own way of visits they have made individually to places of historic interest?
5. If your school has a lantern do you use it to aid your class, through the use of pictures, to fix in their minds the story you have just told?
6. What book has given you the most information concerning our local history? If you have found it difficult to get material for this part of the course, have you availed yourself of the facilities of the Pedagogical Library, the Library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, or the libraries of local historical societies?

(GRADE FIVE.)

1. Which do you think are the three most important stories of Grade 5A? After making your choice read carefully the foreword on page 53 of the course of study, noting the object of the year's work.
Are those you have chosen the most important from the point of view of the course of study?
2. The course of study suggests that "the simple dramatization of a story will contribute to the interest of a lesson, and will serve to fix important points in the minds of the children." To what extent have you found dramatization of help? Which of the stories best lend themselves to dramatization?
3. To what extent have you been able to arouse interest in the work by means of scrap books, or collections of pictures, post-cards, and relics?
To what extent do you use the lantern in your teaching. Do you point out to the pupils the significant things in the pictures?
4. Have you found it profitable to use the helps to teachers found in text-books or supplementary histories in the forms of questions, paragraph headings, pictures, and outlines?
5. Some of the characters about whom stories are to be told in Grade Five are merely picturesque or typical of their time. In other cases the individual is indissolubly associated with great events. Do you recognize this distinction in your teaching?
6. The number of lessons allotted to the different characters is to a certain extent a measure of their historical importance. Do you keep this in mind in adding details to your stories?

QUESTIONS FOR PUPILS.

HISTORY.

(GRADE 6A.)

(NOTE.—The following questions are issued at the opening of the term for the purpose of interpreting for teachers the aims and limits of certain portions of the course in history. Later in the term another set of questions constructed along similar lines will be sent out for use with the pupils. The general character of the answers that should be required of pupils is indicated on the accompanying sheet of "Answers to Questions in History.")

1. (a) What is the title of the history book you use?
(b) Who wrote it?
(c) What is the best way to find out what your book has to say about Socrates?
2. (a) In what century were you born?
(b) In what century was your father born?
(c) When we say, "The United States declared war on Germany in 1917," what does "1917" mean?
3. Write the names of two boys or girls that you know of whose parents came from a European country. Tell of some customs that these people brought with them to America.
4. Why is a long distance race sometimes called a Marathon?
Name something that you have seen that is copied from the Greeks.
5. In helping to form our Constitution, James Madison studied the constitutions of over one hundred Greek cities. Why should he have looked to ancient Greece for suggestions for a form of government for our country?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN HISTORY—GRADE 6A.

(NOTE.—The following answers to the history questions of September 8, 1919, are not to be considered as the only possible answers, but rather as representing the types of answers that should be expected of pupils. They are intended, moreover, to show in a general way the amount of detail which should be entered into and the point of view from which the respective topics should be approached.)

1. (a) The teacher should require the pupil to state the title of the book in full as printed on the title page, correctly spelled and properly capitalized. Sub-titles may be omitted.
(b) The teacher should require the name of the author or authors as printed on the title page. (Degrees and positions should not be included.)
(c) Pupils should describe the proper use of the index.
2. (a) Twentieth century.
(b) Nineteenth century.
(c) The pupil should indicate that "1917" shows how many years have elapsed between the birth of Christ and the event mentioned.
3. Answers to this question will vary.
In answering the second part, the pupils may mention any peculiarities of dress, diet, amusements, religious observance, or social customs which may have come to their knowledge.

NOTE.—In the discussion of this topic the teacher should lead the pupil to appreciate the finer elements in the culture of our foreign populations.

4. The answer to the first part of the question is the story of how the news of the Battle of Marathon was brought to Athens.

In answering the second part of the question pupils may name buildings, architectural or other ornaments, copies of Greek statues, and the like.

5. Pupils in answering this question should tell about the democratic self-government that was characteristic of Greek cities.

(GRADE 7A.)

1. (a) What is the title of the history book you use?
(b) Who wrote it?
(c) What is the best way to find out what your book has to say about John Smith?
2. Teachers will have the following extract either mimeographed or placed on the board. The pupils are to be given not more than ten minutes in which to make an outline giving (a) the reasons why the Pilgrims left England for Holland; (b) the reasons why they came to America.

It is well known unto the godly how in the north parts of England many became enlightened by the word of God, and began to reform their lives. But they could not long continue in any peaceable condition, but were hunted and persecuted on every side. For some were taken and clapt up in prison, others had their houses beset and watched night and day, and the most were fain to fly to Leyden in Holland where they heard was freedom of religion for all men.

After they had lived in this city about some eleven or twelve years they began to talk of removal to some other place. Not out of any new-fangledness, but for sundry weighty and solid reasons. And first, they saw that if a better and easier place of living could be had, it would draw many to join them.

But that which was of all sorrows most heavy to be borne, was that many of their children were drawn away by the youth in that country into extravagant and dangerous courses.

Lastly a great hope and inward zeal they had of advancing the gospel of the kingdom of Christ in those remote parts of the world.

The place they had thoughts on was some of those vast and unpeopled parts of America, which are fruitful and fit for habitation.

Adapted from History of the Plymouth Plantation, by William Bradford.

3. Philadelphia was founded in 1682, Lancaster about 1720, Pittsburgh about 1765. What geographical reasons are there for these settlements having occurred in the order given?
4. Develop the account suggested by the following outline:
The settlement of Virginia.
First immigrants poor noblemen, adventurers, and unsuccessful merchants.
Lack of farmers and other workers.
Lack of food brings on disorders and sickness; the starving time.
Captain John Smith saves the colony; gets food from the Indians; his rule for the colony "work or starve."
5. The teachers will place the following sentences on the board. The pupils are to rewrite them filling in the proper names and dates:
(a) The first permanent English settlement in America was made at.....in the year.....
(b) The Pilgrims landed at.....in New England in the year.....

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN HISTORY—GRADE 7A.

1. (a) The teacher should require the pupil to state the title of the book in full as printed on the title page, correctly spelled and properly capitalized. Sub-titles may be omitted.
- (b) The teacher should require the name of the author or authors as printed on the title page. (Degrees and positions should not be included.)
- (c) Pupils should describe the proper use of the index.
2. Why the Pilgrims left England for Holland.
 1. Persecution in England.
 2. Freedom of religion in Holland.
 Why they came to America.
 1. Desire to find a more attractive place.
 2. Desire to remove their children from bad influences in Holland.
 3. Desire to spread Christianity.
3. Among the geographical reasons which the pupils may be expected to mention are:
 - Distance from the coast;
 - Ease of access by river as accounting for the early settlement of Philadelphia;
 - Effect of the mountain barrier as an obstacle to travel.
4. Any story in which the pupil covers the points indicated in the outline should be accepted. A coherent account expressed in complete sentences should be insisted upon.
5. (a) Jamestown; 1607.
- (b) Plymouth; 1620.

QUESTIONS FOR PUPILS.

(GRADE 8A.)

1. (a) What is the title of the history book you use?
- (b) Who wrote it?
- (c) What is the best way to find out what your book has to say about Eli Whitney?
2. Teachers will have the following extract either mimeographed or placed on the board. The pupils are to be given not more than ten minutes in which to make an outline covering the chief points mentioned.

Feb. 23, 1820. Members of the House of Representatives called upon me; and, conversing on the Missouri slave question, which at this time agitates Congress and the nation, asked my opinion of agreeing to a compromise. The division in Congress and the nation is nearly equal on both sides. The argument on the free side is, the duty of preventing the extension of slavery in the immense country from the Mississippi River to the South Sea. The argument on the slave side is, that Congress has no power by the Constitution to prohibit slavery in any State, and the zealots say, not in any Territory. The proposed compromise is to admit Missouri without any restriction as to slavery, but to prohibit the future introduction of slaves in all territories of the United States north of 36° 30' latitude. I told these gentlemen that my opinion was, the question could be settled not otherwise than by a compromise.

March 2d. The compromise of the slave question was this day carried in Congress by the influence of Clay.

Adapted from the diary of John Quincy Adams.

3. Tell the story indicated by the following outline:
The Erie Canal.
Location.
Reasons for its construction.
Effects upon the West; upon New York; upon other coast cities.
4. (a) About how long ago was the Monroe Doctrine announced as a policy of this country?

- (b) Tell about the circumstances that led to it.
- (c) State the policy which this doctrine sets forth.
- (d) What circumstances have recently made it an important subject of discussion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IN HISTORY—GRADE 8A.

1. (a) The teacher should require the pupil to state the title of the book in full as printed on the title page, correctly spelled and properly capitalized. Sub-titles may be omitted.
- (b) The teacher should require the name of the author or authors as printed on the title page. (Degrees and positions should not be included.)
- (c) Pupils should describe the proper use of the index.
2. The Missouri Compromise.
 - (a) The situation in Congress.
 - (b) The argument on the Free side.
 - (c) The argument on the Slave side.
 - (d) The proposed compromise.
 - (e) How and when settled.
3. Any story in which the pupil covers the points indicated in the outline should be accepted. A coherent account expressed in complete sentences should be insisted upon.
4. (a) The Monroe Doctrine was announced about a century ago (or about one hundred years ago).
- (b) A statement of the circumstances that led to the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine should include a reference to the successful revolt of the Spanish colonies in America; the weakness of the new republics; the danger from Europe (The Holy Alliance).
- (c) Monroe's Message contains the following statements:

In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. . . .

We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. . . .

With the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

—Monroe's Annual Message, December 2, 1823.

In answering this part of the question pupils should indicate that they understand:

- (1) that the policy of America is not to interfere in European affairs unless our own rights are threatened;
- (2) that our government regards as dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt to set up monarchical governments in America;
- (3) that our government would regard as an unfriendly act any attempt on the part of a European nation to interfere with the affairs of any independent nation in America.
- (d) The answers of the pupils should mention the discussion concerning the terms of the Treaty of Peace which ended the Great War, and the proposal for a League of Nations.

The Mosque of Hebron

In the religion of Islam there are certain shrines and holy places that no unbeliever must enter. Few Europeans have penetrated Mecca, and that only in disguise and at the risk of summary judgment and execution if discovered. And there are other shrines, only less sacred than Mecca, to which, so jealously are they guarded, few but Mohammedans have ever obtained access.

One of these is the mosque at Hebron, thirty-five miles from Jerusalem. Here the patriarch Abraham, his wife Sarah, with Isaac, Rebecca, Joseph and Leah, are supposed to be buried. Abraham is called by the Mohammedans Khalil Allah, the friend of God, and they regard Hebron as one of the four holy cities of the world, Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem being the others. Accordingly, the Haram, or sacred enclosure surrounding the mosque, has been carefully kept free from the contaminating presence of unbelievers. No Jew or Christian may ascend above the seventh step of the flight leading to the doorway on the south side, the side that faces Mecca. And only a few Europeans of high rank have ever been admitted.

But recently a party of American Red Cross workers was permitted to enter the sacred precincts by the Moslem chief of police—nearly the first Christian visitors since the conquest of the Holy Land by the Turks eight hundred years ago. The Haram is built over the supposed site of the cave of Macpelah. Within the sacred area are the mosque, tombs, and the dwellings of dervishes and guardians. The mosque was erected by the Crusaders between 1167 and 1187 on the site of a church built by Justinian.

The reason for the permission given the Red Cross workers—the highest mark of consideration that the Mohammedans could display—was the work of the Red Cross among Moslems in Palestine. The work for Mohammedan children, particularly the blind, who have received the same attention at the various Red Cross dispensaries, hospitals and orphanages in Palestine as Hebrew and Christian children, so stirred the Turkish people that in grateful recognition they caused the mosque to be opened.

This recognition of and gratitude for the work of the Red Cross is worldwide, and now that the war is over, now that the foreign field has so narrowed down that the Red Cross can turn its attention to the problems that await it at home.

Tuberculosis claims 200,000 lives every year in this country. Over 16,000 mothers die in childbirth, and during the war, for every American soldier that died in France eight American babies were buried. By accidents 100,000 people were killed, and half a million crippled so that they can no longer earn their own living.

And nearly all of this might be prevented. By offering courses in First Aid, in Child Care, in Home Hygiene and Care of the Sick, by the expansion of Home Service and the extension of public health nursing, the Red Cross hopes to co-operate with all other existing welfare and public health organiza-

tions, with religious and philanthropic societies, in a nation-wide campaign for better public health conditions. The annual roll-call, to be held November 2 to 11, will give the country a chance to do this—to register a vote of confidence and to reaffirm allegiance to the organized humanitarianism which is what the Red Cross stands for.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912,

of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, published monthly, except July, August and September, at Philadelphia, Pa., for October 1, 1919.

County of Philadelphia. } ss.
State of Pennsylvania, }

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Carl Litle, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the business manager of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, MCKINLEY PUBLISHING CO., Philadelphia, Pa.
Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Managing Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Business Manager, CARL LITTLE, Philadelphia, Pa.

2. That the owners are (give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent. or more of the total amount of stock).

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
CHARLES S. MCKINLEY, Youngstown, O.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are (if there are none, so state).

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is.....

(This information is required from daily publications only.)

CARL LITTLE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of September, 1919.

JULIA M. O'BRIEN.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY PROFESSOR WAYLAND J. CHASE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

WILSON, WOODROW. *The State*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1918. Pp. v, 554. \$2.00.

LOWELL, A. LAWRENCE. *Greater European Governments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918. Pp. xi, 329. \$1.50.

Both of these manuals were prepared with a view especially to the needs of the Students' Army Training Corps, and both are revisions or condensations of standard earlier works of these distinguished scholars and administrators. The revision of "The State" was done by Professor Elliott, of the University of California, who has left the first half dozen chapters, dealing with the origin, nature, functions and objects of government and the nature of law, as they were in earlier editions, but for the chapters on ancient Greece, Rome, Norway and Sweden in the earlier editions has substituted new chapters on Italy, Belgium, Serbia, Roumania, Bulgaria, modern Greece, Russia, Turkey and Japan, and also one on After the War. The chapters on England, France, United States, Switzerland, Germany and Austria-Hungary have been revised, the governments of the last two being described as they were in 1914 with a brief statement of the conditions existing in the last of 1918. At the close of the volume a brief chapter presents a summary of constitutional and administrative developments which have been occurring from the dawn of civilization till now.

"Greater European Governments," as its title indicates, has a less comprehensive scope than its companion, and in its dozen chapters deals only with England, France, Italy, Germany and Austria-Hungary. It is an abridgment of the author's "Government of England" and his "Government and Parties in Continental Europe," and although some of the changes that have occurred since the war have been incorporated in this manual, there has been no attempt to cover the conditions brought about by the war.

These are both authoritative treatises, presenting tersely but clearly the outstanding features of the governments considered, and they are sure to be serviceable to a wide range of readers. It is to be regretted that both of them lack an index.

IMBRIE, ROBERT WHITNEY. *Behind the Wheel of a War Ambulance*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Co., 1918. Pp. 248. \$1.50.

In December, 1915, the author became a member of the American Ambulance, an offspring of the American Hospital at Neuilly, France. At this time this consisted of five "sections," four in the field and one in Paris. Each field section besides its auxiliary cars comprised twenty ambulances of a uniform type, gifts of Americans and driven by volunteers from this country who served without compensation and furnished their own equipment and uniforms. Each section was commanded by a French officer, and eventually, though this was not at first the case, all who comprised it became members of the French army. For eighteen months Mr. Imbrie was in this service, and his field of activity ranged from the region of the Aisne to the Somme, thence to Verdun, and finally to the Balkans, where for especially distinguished achievement in almost inaccessible parts of Albania he was decorated with the Croix de Guerre. His story is told with superlative modesty, yet the hazards of this service and the hardihood of the participants are vividly revealed. Driving an ambulance at night without lights in a shell-harassed area where roads inevitably became quickly transformed into successions of

shell-craters and quagmires, seemed to offer great attraction to the adventurous, but surely it was fraught with the utmost danger. Under such conditions "a chap, though he started out full of peace and good-will, was liable to come back full of shrapnel and shell splinters."

The narrative is stirringly told throughout, and constitutes one of the best accounts that has yet appeared of this form of war experience.

SHARPLESS, ISAAC. *Political Leaders of Provincial Pennsylvania*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919. Pp. 248. \$2.50.

The introductory chapter draws sharp the distinction between policy and principle, utility and conscience, as bases of private and public conduct, and presents at some length the Quaker's conception of duty to God and fellow-man. The chapter is pertinent, for the succeeding chapters comprise the biographies of eight Quaker statesmen and were written to show "the applicability (or otherwise) to the practical affairs of government of the principles which to some extent ruled their lives." In the views of the author the results indicate that "the application of a Quaker conscience to state affairs in a non-Quaker community is possible." Whether or not the reader accepts this conclusion, he will find in the series of biographies an excellent history of colonial Pennsylvania. William Penn, Thomas Lloyd, James Logan, David Lloyd, John Kinsey, James Pemberton, Isaac Norris and John Dickinson comprise the eight, and the sweep of their lives extends from the beginnings of the colony to Revolutionary times. The charter given to Penn with its proprietary prerogatives, class distinctions and other feudal features vested him with absolute powers that seem entirely inconsistent with his aspirations for democracy and with his Quaker principles. Small wonder is it that there should have arisen among his fellow-citizens champions such as many of these eight were who struggled valiantly to establish the supremacy of representative assembly in the colony and to found there a real democracy.

LARNED, J. N., WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, DONALD E. SMITH, and GRACE F. CALDWELL. *English Leadership*. Springfield: C. A. Nichols Co., 1918. Pp. 400. \$2.75.

One of the weaknesses of this book is due to the fact that there are too many authors, and hence repetition of certain phases of the history of England. It is built around Mr. Larned's essay, "English Leadings in Modern History," which he unfortunately did not live to complete. His generalizations are sound and useful for those not acquainted with the details of English history. He confines his work, however, to the development of representative institutions in the Empire, as well as in England. As in most books dealing in general movements there are some slight errors in detail, as on page 137, where he speaks of the new constitutions for the colonies at the time of the Revolution. The editorial work on this essay is not up to the standard of the work itself. Explanations are thrown in where they are not called for, and are too detailed for the type of work Mr. Larned was doing. Quotations from secondary material often break into the continuity of Larned's work. At times it is hard to determine where the bracketed material ends and Larned's work is resumed. Page 94 ff.

Professor Taft's so-called introductory chapter supplements Mr. Larned's essay very well by pointing out something of the development of civil liberty and individual freedom as shown in the courts. He also sticks close to the central theme by adding some general observations on the colonial development.

Mr. Smith's essay, "The Geographic Factor in English History," does not seem to fit into the general scheme of the

book. The influence of geography on English history is handled very well, but one does not see how geography plays a prominent part in England's development of representative government. In the field of colonization there is a closer connection. There are not many historians who will accept the definition of history taken by the writer as a working hypothesis. Page 178.

The last two essays by Miss Caldwell get back to the title of the book. She takes up in the first some of England's contributions to scientific thought. She makes many good points in this essay, but one wonders why Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science are given a prominent place beside the Bacons, Newton, Darwin, Adam Smith, and others of that type. "England's Gift to World Literature" does not fulfill the promise of the title, and is the most disappointing of the essays.

In spite of the minor faults we have noticed, the book is a useful one. It gives suggestions and general views in a way that they can be understood and remembered by those who do not have time to make a detailed study of the history. Its greatest value is in a field which this country needs now, as it suggests many reasons why we should appreciate the work England has done for the world's development.

C. A. SMITH.

University of Wisconsin.

MUIR, RAMSAY. *National Self-Government: Its Growth and Principles; the Culmination of Modern History.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1918. Pp. xi, 312.

This volume, written in direct, clear, and simple style, is commended for reading to every intelligent citizen, and for more thoughtful study to every one charged with the instruction of prospective citizens in problems of government. Professor Muir may not be accurate in every fact or correct in every judgment, but he has presented with substantial accuracy an excellently reasoned, comprehensive view of the development of self-governing ability and institutions and of their intimate relation to the growth of nationalism.

The almost complete omission of reference to the developments in the British self-governing dependencies may be excused in part by the author's treatment of them in another volume, and in part on the ground that they have wielded little direct influence upon European movements. The treatment of the developments in the United States, particularly since 1789, is certainly seriously inadequate and open to criticism for inaccuracy, and for its lack of real appreciation of their character and significance. His unfavorable view of the American system as contrasted with the British is assuredly worthy of reconsideration in the light of their respective workings in the period of the war, if not in the past generation as a whole, though Professor Muir may cite in defense of his calm assumptions the views of not a few American writers. The general neglect of the lesser countries in Europe, as well as elsewhere, and of their contributions, may be justified by the limitations of space, but is not consistent with a just presentation of the case as a whole.

The author has chosen to limit his consideration almost entirely to a study of the French and particularly English developments as typical of democracy and self-government in contrast to the German as typical of autocracy and "enlightened" efficiency. Within this selected field the author's work is highly commendable as a characterization of the basic forces in conflict in the Great War. Probably nowhere has this been done so clearly, accurately, and dispassionately. The German system is set forth as the logical and perfected development of the enlightened (wrongly called benevolent) despotism of the eighteenth century, of

(Continued on page 462)

The Citizen and the Republic

By Woodburn and Moran

A New Civics for High Schools. Published Since the War.

INSTRUCTS the pupil and helps him to understand not only the obligations of citizenship, but specific problems which face American citizens today in their struggle for a more perfect and more efficient democracy. 398 pp., \$1.50.

FEATURES

Full description of American Government—local, municipal, state, and national.

Clear and stimulating discussion of the rights and duties of citizens, forms and functions of government, political parties and their organization and work, constitutional development, enlarging powers of government, and American ideals in government.

Successful treatment of practical present-day problems, such as immigration, popular primaries, the short ballot, initiative and referendum.

Impartial and helpful discussion of controversial questions.

Defines American citizenship, tells how to acquire it, the right to vote, and how to avoid dual nationality.

Reflects the New Spirit of the New Democracy

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

New York: 449 Fourth Ave. Chicago: 2457 Prairie Ave.

The Historical Outlook

A JOURNAL FOR READERS, STUDENTS, AND TEACHERS OF HISTORY.

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine.

Published Monthly, except July, August and September, by
McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO.,
1619 Ranstead Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

ALBERT E. McKINLEY, Editor.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK was founded in 1909 under the name of *The History Teacher's Magazine*. Its scope and aims gradually broadened until it made an appeal to all persons interested in the historical roots of the present.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK is an organ of *The American Historical Association* which has appointed an advisory committee composed of Chairman Prof. Henry Johnson, Prof. Fred Morrow Fling, Dr. James Sullivan, Miss Margaret McGill, Prof. Oscar H. Williams, Prof. Frederic Duncliff.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK is edited in close co-operation with the *National Board of Historical Service*, of Washington, D. C., composed of the following persons: Prof. D. C. Munro, chairman; Prof. J. Schaefer, vice-chairman; W. G. Leland, secretary-treasurer; Prof. C. Becker, Dr. V. S. Clark, Dr. R. D. W. Connor; Profs. A. C. Coolidge, W. E. Dodd, C. R. Fish, G. S. Ford, E. B. Greene, S. B. Harding, C. H. Haskins, C. D. Hazen, C. H. Hull; Dr. G. Hunt; Dr. J. F. Jameson; Profs. H. Johnson, W. E. Lingelbach, Dr. C. Moore; Major F. L. Paxson; Profs. J. T. Shotwell, and F. J. Turner.

THE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE is two dollars a year. Back numbers are available in bound form at three dollars a volume, and in unbound form at twenty-five cents a copy.

which a clear but brief analysis is given (pages 30-33). The self-governing or democratic system is pictured as the outgrowth of English parliamentary institutions, and experience modified by influences arising from the American, French and industrial revolutions, and by the rapid expansion of the educated classes and of material resources in the past century. Rightly, three-quarters of the volume is devoted to the century from 1815 to 1914.

Almost every page challenges the reviewer to comment and usually to commend. In the chapter on the "Era of the Liberal Revolution, 1815-1855," one may especially note the explanation why there was no English revolution in 1848 (pages 78-80) and the critique of Marx (pages 100-107). A large part of the chapter on the "Era of National Unification, 1850-1878," is taken up with clear-cut analyses of the governments and political ideals of Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, and Britain, as they had developed to the close of the period. In this and succeeding chapters, the careful consideration of the growing bureaucracy and of the party systems is to be commended, particularly the argument on the merits of the two-party system (pages 157-165).

The two chapters on the "Rival Systems in Operation, 1878-1900," and on the "Brewing of the Storm, 1900-1914," constitute the really original contribution of this book, and furnish an excellent statement of the merits of democracy, notably in the form of the English parliamentary system, in contrast with autocracy as exemplified by Germany. Time has already robbed the concluding chapter on the "Supreme Issue" of much of its modest merit.

Professor Muir has written admirably of the historical evolution of the great popular forces of nationalism and self-government in the older European societies which have borne the brunt of the recent great struggle to insure their continuance. An equally competent treatise supplementing it by an exposition of the corresponding developments in the younger societies of America and of the British Dominions beyond the seas is a desideratum.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Wesleyan University.

BOOKS ON HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES FROM AUGUST 30 TO SEPTEMBER 27, 1919.

LISTED BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, PH.D.

AMERICAN HISTORY.

- Abbot, Willis J. The story of our Merchant Marine. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead. 373 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Bancroft, H. H. Illinois, a historical resumé. Springfield, Ill.: Ill. Centennial Commission. 13 pp.
- Caldwell, A. B., editor. History of the American negro. Vol. 3. Atlanta, Ga.: A. B. Caldwell Pub. Co. 757 pp. \$3.00.
- Chung, Henry. The Oriental policy of the United States. Chicago: Revell. 306 pp. (11 pp. bibls.). \$2.00, net.
- Inman, Samuel G. Intervention in Mexico [account of United States-Mexican relations.] N. Y.: Association Press. 248 pp. \$1.50.
- McLean, John. One hundred years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Co. 298 pp.
- Meany, E. S., and Condon, J. T. Washington's first constitution and proceedings of the convention. Seattle, Wash.: Univ. of Wash. 104 pp. 50 cents.
- Pepper, Charles M. American foreign trade; the United States as a world power. N. Y.: Century Co. 350 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Shores, Venila L. The Hayes-Conkling controversy, 1877-1879. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College. 216-279 pp. 75 cents.
- U. S. Department of State. American-Japanese discussions relating to land tenure law of California. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 28 pp.

- Veyra, Jaime C. de. Philippine independence. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 43 pp. Supt. of Docs. 10 cents.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

- Compston, Herbert F. B., editor. The inscription of the stele of Mesa, commonly called the Moabite stone. N. Y.: Macmillan. 16 pp. 20 cents.
- Giles, Alex F. The Roman civilization. N. Y.: Stokes. 160 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Sandys, John E. Latin epigraphy; an introduction to the study of Latin inscriptions. N. Y.: Putnam. 324 pp. (5½ pp. bibls.). \$3.75, net.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

- Hearnshaw, Fossey J. C. Select extracts from chronicles and records relating to English towns in the Middle Ages. N. Y.: Macmillan. 63 pp. 30 cents, net.
- Lucas, Charles P. The war and the empire. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 48 pp. 75 cents, net.
- Turner, Edward R. Ireland and England; in the past and at present. N. Y.: Century Co. 504 pp. (9½ pp. bibls.). \$3.00, net.

EUROPEAN HISTORY.

- Holt, L. H., and Chilton, A. W. A brief history of Europe from 1789 to 1815. N. Y.: Macmillan. 358 pp. \$2.75, net.
- Logio, George C. Bulgaria; problems and politics. N. Y.: Doran. 285 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Papadopoulos, Alexander. Persecutions of the Greeks in Turkey before the European War. N. Y.: American-Hellenic Society. 147 pp. 50 cents.
- Smyth, P. Hugh. The Reformation. Chicago: Extension Press. 241 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Vandervelde, Emile. Three aspects of the Russian revolution. N. Y.: Scribner. 280 pp. \$1.75, net.
- Weston, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar. The black slaves of Prussia. Letter addressed to J. C. Smuts relative to German rule in East Africa. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 14 pp.
- Wilcox, E. H. Russia's ruin. N. Y.: Scribner. 316 pp. \$5.50, net.

THE GREAT WAR.

- Allied and Associated Powers. Treaty of peace with Germany. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 194 pp.
- Am. Journal of Internat. Law. Diplomatic correspondence between the United States and belligerent governments relating to neutral rights and commerce. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 393 pp. \$1.25.
- Bogitshevich, M. Causes of the war . . . with special reference to Russia and Serbia. N. Y.: Lemcke and Buechner. 135 pp. \$1.00.
- Crime (The). By a German, author of "J'accuse." Vol. 3. War aims. N. Y.: Doran. 377 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Documents and statements relating to peace proposals and war aims (December, 1916-November, 1918). N. Y.: Macmillan. 259 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Hammond, C. S., and Co. Hammond's historical and statistical atlas of the world war. N. Y.: C. S. Hammond & Co. 24 pp. 25 cents.
- Hecht, George J., compiler and editor. The war in cartoons. N. Y.: Dutton. 207 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Hibberd, Benjamin H. Effects of the Great War upon agriculture in the United States and Great Britain. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 232 pp. \$1.00.
- Latourette, K. S., and others. China, the United States and the war. China-Japanese negotiations, 1915-1918. Boston: World Peace Foundation. 60 pp.
- Punch's (Mr.) history of the Great War. N. Y.: Stokes. 303 pp. \$4.00, net.
- Raemaeker, Louis. Raemaeker's cartoon history of the war. Vol. 3. The third twelvemonth of the war. N. Y.: Century Co. 208 pp. \$1.75, net.
- Ratification of treaties. Methods and procedure in foreign countries relative to the ratification of treaties [etc.]. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 280 pp.
- Semiofficial summary of the treaty of peace between the twenty-seven allied and associated powers and Ger-

many as handed to the German plenipotentiaries at the Peace Conference on May 7, 1919. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 38 pp.

Warren, B. S., and Bolduan, C. F. War activities of the U. S. Public Health Service. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 27 pp.

Willoughby, William F. Government organization in war time and after; a survey of the federal civil agencies created for the prosecution of the war. N. Y.: Appleton. 370 pp. \$2.50, net.

Woolcott, Alexander. The command is forward; tales of the A. E. F. battlefields as they appeared in *The Stars and Stripes*. N. Y.: Century Co. 304 pp. \$1.75, net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Gibbons, Herbert A. The new map of Asia, 1900-1919. N. Y.: Century Co. 571 pp. \$2.50, net.

Owen, Grace A. The wonderful story of Illinois; a pageant. Springfield, Ill.: Ill. Hist. Commission. 48 pp.

Rice, Wallace D. C. The masque of Illinois. 17 pp. The pageant of the Illinois country. Five parts, a sixth part to be written from local history. 57 pp. Springfield, Ill.: Ill. Centennial Commission.

Statesmen's (The) Year Book for the Year 1919. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1476 pp. \$6.50, net.

Werner, Edward T. C. China of the Chinese [History of China]. N. Y.: Scribner. 309 pp. \$3.00.

BIOGRAPHY.

Young, Norwood. The life of Frederick the Great. N. Y.: Holt. 433 pp. (7 pp. bibls.). \$2.50, net.

Cooke, Arthur O. The story of Lord Kitchener. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 50 cents.

Rare Lincolniana, No. 14. (*Mag. of History*, extra No. 65.) Tarrytown, N. Y.: W. Abbott. 68 pp. \$4.00.

Spence, Lewis. The story of Robert the Bruce. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 95 pp. 50 cents.

Sears, Joseph H. The career of Leonard Wood. N. Y.: Appleton. 272 pp. \$1.50, net.

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS.

Black, Henry C. The relation of the executive power to legislation. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press. 178 pp. \$1.60, net.

Burton, Theodore E. Modern political tendencies. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press. 119 pp. \$1.25, net.

Hearnshaw, Fossey J. C. Democracy at the crossways; a study in politics and history with special reference to Great Britain. N. Y.: Macmillan. 511 pp. \$8.00, net.

League (The) of Nations. By Viscount Grey [etc., etc.]. [Nine essays, each of which has appeared as a separate pamphlet.] N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 149 pp. \$1.60.

Parsons, Geoffrey. The land of fair play: How America is governed. N. Y.: Scribner. 189 pp. \$1.25, net.

Root, Elihu. The League of Nations [letters relative to]. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 23 pp.

LIST OF HISTORICAL ARTICLES IN CURRENT PERIODICALS.

COMPILED BY LEO F. STOCK.

EUROPE, GENERAL, MISCELLANEOUS.

The Church in North America (Greenland) in the Middle Ages. Laurence M. S. Larson (*Catholic Historical Review*, July-October).

Notes on the Beginnings of Aeronautics in America. George E. Hastings (*American Historical Review*, October).

The Struggle for Independence in Argentina. Rufino Blanco-Fombona (*Inter-America*, October).

The Peace of 1814-1815. Harold Spender (*Current History*, October).

The Diplomatic Preliminaries of the Crimean War. Bernadotte E. Schmitt (*American Historical Review*, October).

Some Recollections. Viscount Haldane (*Atlantic Monthly*,

October). Conversations with the Kaiser and Chancellor, 1906-1912.

The Heart of the Trouble in Mexico. Charles Johnston (*Atlantic Monthly*, October).

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

Was there a "Common Council" before Parliament? Albert B. White (*American Historical Review*, October).

The Rock of Fergus. J. A. Strahan (*Blackwood's Magazine*, September). Historical reasons for Ulster's opposition to Irish freedom.

The English Manufacturers and the Commercial Treaty of 1786 with France. Witt Bowden (*American Historical Review*, October).

Life and Letters of Sir Wilfred Laurier. Oscar D. Skelton (*Century*, October).

THE GREAT WAR AND ITS PROBLEMS.

Roots of the War (continued). William S. Davis, in collaboration with William Anderson and Mason W. Tyler (*Century*, October).

Strategy on the Western Front (concluded). Lieut. Col. H. H. Sargent, U. S. A., retired (*North American Review*, October).

The Ex-Emperor William and the Napoleonic Precedent. Norwood Young (*Nineteenth Century and After*, September).

Belgium and Holland: And the Freedom of the Scheldt. Emile Cammaerts (*Nineteenth Century and After*, September).

Italy and the Fiume Question. Julius M. Price (*Fortnightly Review*, September).

The Fight for Public Opinion. Thomas F. Moran. (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number containing proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association).

THE UNITED STATES.

A Great Franciscan in California: Fermín Francisco de Lasuén. Charles E. Chapman (*Catholic Historical Review*, July-October).

The Story of Wisconsin, 1635-1848 (continued). Louise P. Kellogg (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, September).

III. The days of the lead-miners.

Military Organizations of the American Revolution, II. Grace M. Pierce (*D. A. R. Magazine*, October). Origin and development of the army before Boston.

Indiana State Aid for Negro Deportation. Henry N. Sherwood (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number containing proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Association).

The Evolution of Montana Agriculture in its Early Period. M. L. Wilson (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number).

Indiana in the Mexican War. R. C. Buley (*Indiana Magazine of History*, September).

The Competition of the Northwestern States for Immigrants. Theodore C. Blegen (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, September).

Missouri in the Kansas Struggle. Mary J. Klem (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number).

Popular Sovereignty and the Colonization of Kansas from 1854 to 1860. William O. Lynch (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number).

The Collapse of the Steamboat Traffic upon the Mississippi: An Inquiry into Causes. Paul W. Brown (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number).

Some Account of Steam Navigation in New England (continued). Francis B. C. Bradlee (*Essex Institute Historical Collections*, October).

Six Constitutions of the Far Northwest. John D. Hicks (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, May; extra number).

Chapters of Roosevelt's Life. William R. Thayer (*North American Review*, October).

Theodore Roosevelt and His Time. Joseph B. Bishop (*Scribner's*, September, October). I. Roosevelt, peacemaker; II. Roosevelt and Trevelyan.

INDISPENSABLE AIDS TO THE SUCCESSFUL TEACHING OF HISTORY

OUTLINE MAPS

The study of Historical Geography by means of the filling in of Outline Maps by the pupil, is now recognized as a necessary part of high school work in History. Many colleges are requiring similar work in their freshman and introductory courses in History, and often it is used with profit in more advanced courses, where maps showing new historical material are to be constructed. Even in the grades it is found that much time can be gained by the use of printed map outlines, in place of the laborious map-drawing by pupils. Many colleges use outline maps in entrance examinations in history; and for ten years the College Entrance Examination Board has included among its questions in history, the placing of historical data upon McKinley Outline Maps.

No series of Outline Maps is so well constructed, so conveniently prepared, so varied in its assortment, or so well adapted to different needs, as the

McKINLEY SERIES OF OUTLINE MAPS

The Series includes large wall outline maps; desk outline maps in three sizes; envelopes of loose maps, assorted as desired; bound maps, in atlas form, for nine periods of history; bound maps, with notepaper interleaved, for six periods of history; and skeleton maps, with coastlines only, for elementary history and geography classes.

OUTLINE MAPS OF THE GREAT WAR: The Western Front, the Eastern Front, the Balkan States, the North Sea and English Channel, Turkey and Eastern Mediterranean, and Austro-Italian Frontier. Issued in the double size and large size. See prices below.

McKinley Wall Outline Maps

Size, 32x44 inches

DESCRIPTION. The Wall Outline Maps show the coast-lines and rivers of the countries and continents, and, usually, the present boundaries of states, together with the lines of latitude and longitude.

PRICE. Single copies, 25 cents each; twenty-five or more copies, 20 cents each. (Postage or expressage extra.)

The series of Wall Outline Maps now includes:

The World (Mercator's Projection).
Europe.
Asia.
Africa.
North America.
South America.
Australia.

England.
British Isles.
France and England.
Greece and Aegean Sea.
Italy.
Central Europe.
Eastern World (Greece to India).
Palestine.
Roman Empire.
Southeastern Europe.

United States.
Eastern United States.
New England.
Middle Atlantic States.
South Atlantic States.
Mississippi Valley, Northern Section.
Mississippi Valley, Southern Section.
Pacific Coast and Plateau States.
Eastern Virginia and Maryland (for Civil War).
City of Philadelphia (price, 30 cents).

Co-ordinate Paper—Wall Size

Sheets of stout paper, 32x48 inches, ruled in both directions, with blocks one-quarter inch square; serviceable in classes in economics, geography and history, for depicting lines and curves of growth or development. They may also be used for constructing chronological charts for history classes.

PRICE. The same as Wall Outline Maps.

Samples of any of the above publications will be cheerfully furnished, to any teacher, upon request.

McKinley Desk Outline Maps

DOUBLE SIZE. 10x15 inches; \$1.00 a hundred; 30 cents for an envelope of twenty maps.

LARGE SIZE. 7½x10 inches; 60 cents a hundred; 20 cents for an envelope of twenty maps.

SMALL SIZE. 5½x7½ inches; 40 cents a hundred; 15 cents for an envelope of twenty maps.

Skeleton Outline Maps

COAST LINES ONLY

The World, Europe, Asia, Africa, North America, South America, Australia, United States.

Geographical and Historical Desk Maps

THE CONTINENTS

The World (Mercator's Projection), Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, North America, South America.

THE UNITED STATES

United States (state boundaries and physical features), United States (state boundaries only).

THE UNITED STATES IN THREE SECTIONS

Eastern United States (east of the Mississippi River), Mississippi Valley, Pacific Coast and Plateau States.

SMALLER SECTIONS OF UNITED STATES AND OF NORTH AMERICA

New England, Coast of New England (for early settlements), Middle Atlantic States, South Atlantic States, Coast of Southern States (for early settlements), Eastern Virginia (for Civil War), Mississippi Valley, Northern Section, Mississippi Valley, Northeastern Section, Mississippi Valley, Northwestern Section, Mississippi Valley, Southern Section and Texas, Southwestern United States, Cuba, Philippines, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York (state of), Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Gulf of Mexico, Panama, etc., West Indies, Canada.

EUROPE AND ITS LARGER DIVISIONS
Europe, Europe (central and southern parts), Central Europe (Charlemagne's Empire, etc.), Mediterranean World, Baltic Lands, Southeastern Europe and Eastern Mediterranean.

SMALLER EUROPEAN DIVISIONS

British Isles, England, Scotland, Ireland, France and the Netherlands (with England), Spain, Germany, Austro-Hungary and Danube Valley, Russia, Greece and Aegean Sea, Italy.

ANCIENT HISTORY AND SPECIAL SUBJECTS

Roman Empire, Central Italy (early Roman History), Ancient Rome (City), Greece (Continental), Ancient Athens, Eastern World (Alexander's Empire, etc.), Palestine, Egypt, India, China.

McKinley Outline Atlases

FOR HISTORY CLASSES

These Atlases consist of twenty-five McKinley Outline Maps specially selected for use in the study of a particular field of history. Each atlas contains several hundred page references to historical atlases and text-books where material can be gained for filling in the maps.

Atlases for the following periods of history:

- No. 1. For United States History.
- " 2. For English History.
- " 3. For Ancient History (including Greece and Rome).
- " 4. For Grecian History.
- " 5. For Roman History.
- " 6. For European History (375-1910 A.D.).
- " 7. For Medieval History (375-1500 A.D.).
- " 8. For Modern History (1450-1918 A.D.).
- " 9. For General History.

PRICE. 25 cents (net) each.

SPECIAL ATLASES. In orders of 100 Atlases, the publishers will bind the McKinley Outline Maps in any desired assortment. Price for such Special Atlases, 35 cents (net) each.

McKinley Historical Notebooks

The notebooks consist of the McKinley Outline Maps combined with blank leaves to constitute an historical notebook of 104 pages.

At present there are notebooks for—

- American History.
- English History.
- Ancient History.
- European History.

PRICE. 28 cents (net) each.

McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO., 1619 RANSTEAD STREET, PHILADELPHIA

A Source Study for College Classes

The Abolition of Feudalism in France

BY PROFESSOR H. E. BOURNE, COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY,
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

College teachers of European history realize how difficult it is to arrange work from original sources for large classes. The material is not accessible except in fully equipped libraries, and even there it can be found and used only by trained workers familiar with European languages. Moreover, save in seminary classes, the element of time is vital. If any large number of undergraduate students are to be given some practice in examining critically the sources of information these sources must be made accessible in convenient form. This has been done to an extent in certain source books. For the study of typical incidents of the French Revolution, for example, it has been admirably done in Professor Fling's "Parallel Source Problems." In the following exercise the attempt is made to meet the need in the study of one of the great achievements of the early Revolution—the abolition of the feudal régime.

This exercise also possesses a more general interest. It is intended to illustrate the difficulties which beset social legislation of a fundamental character during the Revolution. Similar difficulties surrounded radical change in other countries and at other periods.

Work of this kind, implying ability to deal with legal conceptions and questions of evidence should be undertaken only with advanced college students. It calls for a fair knowledge of the feudal system, and particularly of the remnants of the system imbedded in the structure of French society in the eighteenth century. It should be used after the members of the class have become familiar, through the statements of the text-book or the explanations of the instructor, with the earlier reforms of the Constituent Assembly.

One of the conditions controlling the form of such an exercise is brevity. In making selections from speeches, reports, laws, and memorials, it has been possible to include only what was pertinent to the problem in hand. To lessen the danger of misconception in reading half a dozen sentences from a long speech or report omissions have been carefully indicated. Summaries, wherever they take the place of translations, have been enclosed in brackets.

Most of the documents have been taken from the collection made by MM. Sagnac and Caron, and embodied in the volume referred to in the bibliographical list given below. It is hoped that they are typical of the larger number (354) in that collection, as it was meant to be typical of the material in the archives.

It is believed that the selections suffice to render possible some practice in a species of simplified research, with incidental consideration of critical questions, and that the study will also result in a more adequate appreciation of the work of the Constituent Assembly. The instructor making use of this study will doubtless furnish the members of the class with a list of the particular questions to which their attention should be drawn. He will necessarily explain the critical method as applied to such material. A tentative list of questions is appended.

In the preparation of this exercise the author has had the assistance of Miss Eleanor Ferris, of the Department of History, in the College for Women.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL LIST.

Documents.

Les Comités des Droits féodaux et de Législation et l'abolition du Régime seigneurial. Edited by Ph. Sagnac and P. Caron. Paris, 1907. This is one of the collection of "Unpublished Documents on the Economic History of the French Revolution," published under the auspices of a commission of which Prof. A. Aulard is chairman.

Cited as "Documents" in this exercise.

Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée Nationale. Paris, 1789-91. The official record of the first National Assembly.

Duvergier, Collection des Lois. The most convenient collection of French laws and decrees from 1789 to the present day.

Moniteur, Le, Universel (Reprint). As the publication of this journal began on November 24, 1789, the earlier numbers have only the value of an early collection of speeches, etc.

Historical Discussions.

Introduction, pages IV-XXVI, of the Sagnac-Caron volume.

La Révolution Française et la Féodalité. H. Doniol. Paris, 1883.

La Législation civile de la Révolution. Ph. Sagnac. Paris, 1898.

Les Paysans et la Question paysanne en France dans le dernier quart du XVIII^e Siècle. N. Karéïew. Paris, 1899.

La Révolution Française et le Régime féodal. A. Aulard. Paris, 1919.

The Fourth of August, 1789. The Sources. Carl Christophelsmeier. The University Studies. University of Nebraska, Vol. 6, 293-358. Lincoln, 1906.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.—Reprints of this source study for class use may be obtained from the McKinley Publishing Co., at price of twenty cents a copy.

I. A TYPICAL INCIDENT OF JULY, 1789.

Complaint of the Comte de Germiny regarding the disorders at Saint-Christophe-le-Jajolet, 20 August, 1789.

"My Lords, I expect, from your sense of justice and from the patriotic sentiments which inspire you, that you will come to my rescue in the unhappy circumstances in which I find myself.

"On the 29th of July, 1789, a band of strange brigands joined with my vassals and those of Vrgni, the parish next to mine, and came, to the number of two hundred, to my chateau of Sassy, parish of Saint-Christophe, near Argentan, and, after breaking the locks of the wardrobes where my title-deeds were stored, they took a large number of them, together with registers which are indispensable to me, and carried them off or burned them in the woods near my chateau; my guard could make no resistance, being the sole protector of the estate, on which I do not reside. These wretches sounded the tocsin in the neighboring parishes in order to call together a larger number. I am the more unhappy because of this loss in that I have never allowed my vassals to feel the odious burden of the old feudalism, from which I am enchanted to have them redeemed in the present state of affairs; but who can ever estimate or prove the damage they have done to my property? I appeal to your wisdom that some way or other may be found by the National Assembly of restoring to me what I have lost. . . .

"I shall take no action against those whom I know among the number of these brigands, who, not content with burning my papers, killed all my pigeons. But I await full justice from the spirit of equity which rules you and which gives me the greatest confidence."—Documents, No. 62.

II. THE COMMOTION AND THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

At the evening session of the National Assembly, on August 4, 1789, the president read the project of a regulation, decided upon the day before and referred to the drafting committee. This was apropos of the disturbances reported from the provinces. The last two paragraphs declared that,

"All customary dues or payments should be paid as before, until otherwise ordered by the Assembly.

"Finally the laws established for the security of persons and properties should be everywhere respected."

When this had been read the Vicomte de Noailles said, among other things:

"The purpose of the project which the Assembly has just heard is to check the disorders in the provinces, to assure public liberty, and to support proprietors in their true rights.

"But how can one hope to succeed without knowing what is the cause of the insurrection which has taken place, and how correct the evil without removing the cause?"

The Vicomte made proposals, the third and fourth of which were:

"3rd. That all feudal dues shall be purchasable by the communities, either in money or some other equivalent, at a just appraisalment, that is, according to the revenue of an average year.

"4th. That seigniorial *corvées*, mainmortes and other personal servitudes shall be annulled without redemption (purchase)."

The Duc d'Aiguillon then said, among other things:

"It is not only brigands who wish to enrich themselves in the midst of calamities; in several provinces the whole people forms a sort of league to destroy the chateaux, to ravage the lands, and above all to take possession of the records, where feudal titles are preserved. The people is bent on ridding itself of the yoke which has rested on its neck for centuries. We must confess, gentlemen, although this uprising is blameworthy . . . the people can find an excuse in the oppression from which it has suffered. The owners of fiefs, or of seigniorial lands, are, it is true, only rarely guilty of the excesses of which their vassals complain; but their agents are often pitiless, and the wretched farmer, subjected to the barbarous remnants of the feudal laws still existing in France, groans at the constraint under which he suffers. Of course, these rights are property, and all property is sacred; but they are burdensome to the population. . . ."

The Duc d'Aiguillon proposed among other remedies:

"That these rights should henceforward be redeemable, at the option of the tenant, at thirty years' purchase, or at some other valuation, which in each province shall be judged fairer by the National Assembly, in accordance with rates which shall be submitted to it."—*Moniteur*, I, 279-80.

III. THE AUGUST PROGRAM.

The discussion once begun did not stop until not merely feudal dues but the whole system of privilege was condemned in a series of decrees, summed up in the decree of August 11. Six of the articles concern the feudal system.

Article I. "The National Assembly completely abolishes the feudal system and decrees that those rights and dues, both feudal and *censuel*, which derive from or represent serfdom, real or personal, or personal servitude, are abolished without indemnification; all others are declared redeemable, the rate and manner of redemption to be determined by the National Assembly. Nevertheless, those of the said rights, which are not extinguished by this decree, shall continue to be collected until indemnification (be accomplished)."

Article II. (Concerning the right of dovecote.)

Article III. (Hunting rights.)

Article IV. (Seigniorial jurisdiction and courts.)

Article V. (Tithes.)

Article VI. "All perpetual rents, whether in kind or in money, of whatsoever sort they may be, whatever their origin . . . are redeemable; champarts of every description shall be equally so at rates fixed by the Assembly."—Documents, pp. 1-2.

On August 12, a Feudal Committee was appointed, of which Goupil de Prefelne was president, and Merlin, of Douai, secretary.

On September 4 a preliminary report was made by Merlin. It was written in the spirit of severe criticism of the feudal régime, in particular of rights derived from, or representing, feudal power or servitude.

Among other things, the following statement was made:

"All our attention should, therefore, be directed toward rights which represent *mainmorte* and servitude. It would be of great practical value to make an exact determination of these rights. This would spare seigniors as well as peasants a multitude of ruinous contests at law. . . ."—*Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée constituante*, session of September 4.

IV. THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF FEUDAL DUES IN FRANCE, 1789-1792.

Abbé Tardieu, of Bas-Vivarais, January 16, 1790.

After describing the strained relations of lords and peasant proprietors, the author proceeds:

"For, whence do the seigniors derive the right of *rente*, that is to say, the estates upon which they are established? They all have absolutely the same origin, namely, the munificence of our kings, who, in conquering and organizing the provinces have distributed them to the chiefs of their armies. But, did these brave warriors alone gain the battles? Did not the brave soldiers form the principal strength of the armies . . . should they not have a share in the distribution of conquered lands. . . . The seigniors cannot be authorized to collect *rentes* upon lands which from their origin do not belong to them; it is enough that they occupy peacefully the very rich domains which they hold in full property."—*Documents*, No. 35.

Trippier, alderman at Bar-sur-Aube, August 12, 1789:

"If we go back to the origin of feudal institutions, the seigniors were in ancient times only beneficiaries for life and on terms of military service. When they made themselves hereditary, they obtained regalian taxes only to recompense themselves for the expenses incurred in conducting their vassals to the royal army. The collection of taxes for the profit of the seigniors should have ceased the moment that feudal service fell into disuse; and there was no ground for indemnification. The feudal nobility should alone bear the larger part of the expenses of the army; on the contrary, it obtains appointments, honorable posts, retiring pensions; the nation long since pays almost all the royal taxes; the nobility should therefore make restitution to the people instead of demanding indemnification; the profits of the fiefs are unjustifiable exactions."—*Documents*, No. 2.

Memoir of the farmers of the Ban of Vacqueville, 1789.

Referring to sixteen ruined castles in the district, the author says:

"In the unhappy days of feudal rule all these fortresses belonged to different seigniors who, being almost always at war, descended every year from their

rocky heights to the plain, ravaged our crops and carried off our flocks.

"To protect ourselves against these brigandages, it was necessary to put ourselves under the safeguard of some one of these little sovereigns, who never granted their protection for nothing. It was necessary to submit to burdens of all sorts, to dues in grain, in money, in chickens, etc.; it was necessary to recognize rights of banality, rights of dovecote, chase, fishing, etc. It was necessary to recognize the barbarous right of life and death that they exercised each after his fashion over those whom they called their subjects and who were veritably the most wretched slaves of the earth . . . and when we ask now how all that has been changed, those who know history tell us that it was under the reign of Louis XIII and the ministry of Cardinal Richelieu that the seigniors have lost their right of sovereignty and that their chateaux have been dismantled; but . . . if they have been released from supporting garrisons and contributing to war expenses to defend us, why since this time have they continued to make us pay *tailles*, dues of all sorts, *corvées*, etc.?"

"It is clear that all these collections from us were, on the part of the seigniors, so many crying injustices. . . ."—*Documents*, No. 3.

Administrators of the department of Basses-Alpes, November 20, 1790.

"How many dues have been established by surprise? How many through fear and oppression? How many owe their establishment to the known partiality of the superior courts upon this matter? . . . A single recognition, supported by the prescription of thirty years sufficed according to all our authors to replace the primitive title in the case of a church or of a seignior with high justiciary powers; . . . two recognitions in the case of the ordinary seignior. . . . If it is necessary to follow such rules to-day, there is no usurpation which is not guarded from all attack. The more the title was doubtful, the more recognitions were multiplied, and not a single one of the former seigniors failed to take his precautions. . . ."—*Documents*, No. 122.

V. ATTITUDE OF PEASANTS AND OF PUBLIC BODIES.

Circular letter of the Intermediary Commission of Lorraine and Barrois to the priests of the province, 18 December, 1789:

" . . . We are informed that a false interpretation of Article I of the National Assembly's decrees of 4th August and the days following, is occasioning, in certain districts, a refusal to pay seigniorial dues; this is producing lawsuits and difficulties ruinous for the people. . . .

"We shall examine this article in itself in order to determine the exact meaning; our reasonings shall be simple; we have drawn them entirely from the law itself, which, before being carried out by all, should be studied by all.

"In the first place, the National Assembly entirely abolishes the feudal system, but it does not abolish all the rights which derive from it; it merely declares them redeemable, in order to set free and to relieve

persons and lands in so far as the good of agriculture requires this.

"The rights which it abolishes without indemnification are those which originate in serfdom, real or personal, and those which represent them, such as *corvées*, at least when they do not have a different origin.

"In regard to all other rights, both feudal and *censuel*, they are declared redeemable; the rate and manner of redemption to be determined by the National Assembly, and nevertheless it ordains that they continue to be collected up to the time of indemnification.

"It is only by confusing the meaning of different parts of the text of the law, that certain communities believe themselves to be exempted at once from all obligations towards their seigniors. The decree of the National Assembly, in the distinction which it establishes between the rights extinguished and those which it permits only to be redeemed, is so explicit, that seigniors cannot fail to protest successfully against a refusal which the courts would consider a contravention of the law, and an attack upon property respected by the representatives of the nation. Though consideration for the general welfare . . . has brought about the desire for the suppression of the *cens* and other dues which do not originate in serfdom; though this motive has even given rise to the prohibition, contained in article 6, against creating hereafter any dues which are not redeemable, yet the National Assembly has decreed that, for the extinction of established dues, redemption is the sole lawful method; it would be, therefore, disobedience to its decrees, to deprive seigniors, in fact and at once, of the just enjoyment of the rights and dues which it has excepted from actual and immediate extinction. . . ."—Documents, No. 31.

Petition of the Sieur Roncey, for the villagers of Prâlon (Côte-d'Or), 30 December, 1789:

" . . . The National Assembly, having entirely abolished feudalism and decreed that those rights and dues, both feudal and *censuel* which derive from or represent serfdom, real or personal, or personal servitude, are abolished without indemnification, etc., we thought that our persons and heritages would be freed from all those obligations and services, except the tithe, provided they originated in serfdom or represented it.

"Nevertheless, these seigniors of Prâlon and their bailliff, far from conforming themselves to the decrees of the august National Assembly and from exerting themselves to enter into its views by ceasing to oppress the poor villagers who are without fortune, without means, and without protection, seek, on the contrary, to harass them and attempt by threats, to compel them to pay the feudal and *censuel* dues which did not fall due until the eleventh of November, that is, after their abolition."

"These villagers who know by experience how difficult it would be for them to obtain justice in the existing courts, were ready to continue the payment of these dues rather than attempt a lawsuit which they are not in a position to undergo; nevertheless, before accomplishing the payment, they decided to appeal to

the National Assembly in order to invoke its protection and to beg it to outline the course which they should adopt. . . .

"We confidently expect and we dare to hope that the National Assembly will be good enough to decide whether we must still pay, for this year, the dues whose abolition was declared by the decree of August fourth, and whether we must still be subjected to the servitude of the monopoly of the oven and that of the mill."—Documents, No. 32.

VI. THE REPORT OF THE FEUDAL COMMITTEE, THE DEBATE, AND THE LAW.

From the report made to the National Assembly in the name of the Feudal Committee, on February 8, 1790. By M. Merlin, deputy from Douai.

"What then are the dues that you have abolished without indemnity?

"What are, on the other hand, those which you have permitted to remain, subjecting them simply to extinction by purchase? . . .

"Undoubtedly, in destroying the Feudal Régime you have not meant to deprive the lawful proprietors of fiefs of their possessions; but you have changed the nature of these goods. Freed henceforward from the laws of feudalism, they are regulated by those of real estate. In a word, they have ceased to be fiefs and have become actual freeholds. . . .

"There exist no more fiefs, we should remark, and no more lands subject to *cens*. Thus feudal and *censuelle* superiority has disappeared. . . . Thus all the dues with which former feudal property was burdened must henceforth be treated as charges upon land and income from real estate.

"We now come to the part of the same article which suppresses without indemnity the mainmorte or servitude of persons and of properties, as well as the rights dependent upon either. . . .

"Have you by this act freed from all dues the property as well as the person of the serf? Or, in granting full liberty to the person, and in effacing from even the property all traces of servitude, have you permitted to remain chargeable to this property dues which have nothing servile in themselves. I illustrate.

"A seignior had within his fief two properties, A and B. The property A he granted subject to a *cens*; the property B in *mainmorte*. . . .

"What then is the lot of the owner of the property B? Doubtless, he is as free as the possessor of the property A; but is he more than this? . . . In a word, is his condition to-day better than if in the beginning the grant had been made subject to a *cens* . . . ?

"Your committee does not think that you touched dues which do not form part of the servitude itself, and the burden of which rests alike upon servile and free properties. . . .

"For this reason there is no doubt that the possessor of the property B should remain subject to the dues of *cens* equally with the possessor of the property A. . . .

"Dues alleged to be 'representative' of servitude are to be treated similarly."—Procès-verbal, XIII.

Debate on article 4, title II, decree of 15-28 March, 1790. Morning session of 27 February:

"M. Merlin, spokesman of the Committee on Feudalism, read article 4 of the title on which debate had been begun the preceding day. . . .

"M. Merlin set forth the considerations which had decided the committee to present this article. He thus proved that landed rights which had been converted from servile to *censuel* tenure were not representative of serfdom and should, therefore, be preserved.

"M. Muguet, of Nanthou: In its report the committee has maintained that 'real' serfdom originated in a land grant. The origin of serfdom is unknown. We know only its effects. All the authorities of my province agree in regarding it as an illegal right, acquired by violence and oppression. . . . The practices which, according to our custom, bear most heavily upon the serfs, were invented in 1549 by our estates, composed of the nobles, the superior clergy, and the provosts of the seigniors. According to the decrees of the 4th August, you have abolished without indemnification every kind of serfdom, together with the rights which represent it. This decree has been accepted by the king; it has brought happiness to the inhabitants of my province (Franche Comté). The committee proposes to you that we disgrace ourselves anew with serfdom, and recede from your decree. But can you grant an indemnity for the loss of a right which is contrary to the natural liberty of man? Can you grant an indemnity for a right which you have declared to be abolished without indemnity? . . .

"M. Populus: The proposed article annuls the decrees of the 4th August; it cannot be accepted. . . .

"Personal serfdom was disgraceful. . . . It should therefore be suppressed. 'Real' serfdom was infected by the same taint, the same origin. You abolished it without indemnification; you were just. The principle has been decreed, accepted, published; the country people are counting upon its effect; can you disappoint them? . . ."

The President asked the Assembly whether the debate should or should not be closed.

"The Assembly decided in the affirmative.

"The article was read.

"The new version was read. . . .

"The preference was accorded to the committee's version. . . .

"The session was adjourned at half past two. . . ."
—Moniteur, III, 482-484.

From a speech by Baron de Marguerittes on March 9, 1790, as reported in the *Mercure de France* of March 20:

"You have decreed the suppression *without indemnity* of various feudal and seigniorial rights. This morning again you have pronounced the suppression of others, which made up almost the entire fortune of a great number of families. These rights, authorized by the laws and fortified by all the sanctions that human institutions can receive, were for several cen-

turies treated in families as a veritable property. They formed the patrimony of the majority of the eldest sons, who have agreed to pay considerable sums in annuities to their brothers to reimburse them for their portion of the inheritance from their father, and have used for this purpose the money which came from the dowry of their wives. The money for such annuities was a special mortgage upon these lands, whose principal and most valuable revenue consisted in dues akin to those which you have just suppressed without indemnity. How many fathers have married their children with this as the only dowry. . . . I know some families in my province which will in consequence of this legislation lose 12, 15, and up to 30 thousand livres income. . . ."

DECREE OF MARCH 15-28, 1790.

Title I.

"General consequences of the destruction of the feudal system.

"Art. I. All honorific distinctions, superiority or power resulting from the feudal system are abolished. . . ."

(Followed by twelve other articles.)

Title II.

"Rights which are suppressed without indemnity.

"Art. I. Serfdom that is personal or . . . that derives from the possession of heritages classified as servile . . . and all the consequences of servitude which affect persons or property, are abolished without indemnification.

"Art. 2. Nevertheless, all the lands formerly held by servile tenure . . . shall continue to be subject to the other charges . . . with which they have hitherto been burdened.

"Art. 4. All the acts of enfranchisement by which serfdom, real or mixed, shall have been converted, as to the lands formerly affected by that serfdom, into ground rents and into rights of *lods ou mutation*, shall be executed in accordance with their form and purpose, provided, at least, that the said payments and transfer dues be found not to exceed the payments and dues usual in the same fief or established by the custom or the general practice of the province, in the case of the non-servile lands held *en censive*.

"Art. 12. Seigniorial rights upon the purchase, sale, importation, and exportation of furniture, products, and merchandise . . . are abolished without indemnity.

"Art. 13. Tolls, road and bridge dues . . . suppressed. . . .

"Art. 17. Dues connected with inspection, weights, measures . . . suppressed. . . .

"Art. 19. Rights (known under various names) pertaining to the markets of grain, meat, cattle, fish and other goods and merchandise in fairs, markets . . . suppressed without indemnity; but the buildings . . . shall continue to belong to their proprietors, save the obligation to agree to some rental plan or sale with the municipalities of the locality. . . .

"Art. 23. All rights of *banalité* of the oven, mill, winepress, slaughterhouse are with certain exceptions abolished without indemnity."

(Exceptions having origin in contract noted.)

(Total number of articles in Title II is 39.)

Title III.

"Seigniorial rights which are redeemable.

"Art. 1. Shall be redeemable, but with the obligation of payment until purchase is effected, all profitable rights and dues, both feudal and *censuel*, which are the price of an original grant of land.

"Art. 2. The following are presumed to be such, unless the contrary is proved, (1) all annual seigniorial dues in money, grain, poultry, wax, products or fruits of the earth, owed under the name of *cens*, *censives* . . . *rentes féodales* . . . *champart* . . . *terrage* . . . or any other name whatsoever, which are payable and due only from the landholder or possessor, and by reason of the length of his possession . . . (2) all occasional dues known under the names of *quint*, *requint* . . . *lods et ventes* . . . and any other denominations, which are due because of transfers of title or possession . . . (3) (other minor dues).

"Art. 3. All contests upon the existence or amount of dues mentioned in the preceding article shall be decided according to the proofs authorized by the statutes, customs, and rules observed up to the present time. . . .

"Art. 6. Proprietors of fiefs whose archives and titles should have been burned or pillaged during the commotions beginning with 1789 shall be allowed three years to establish . . . proof of possession for thirty years prior to the fire or pillage of those of the rights belonging to them not suppressed without indemnity."

Art. 8. (Those who renounced through fear have similar privileges.)

Art. 9. (Rate of redemption to be set by further legislation.)—Documents, pp. 173-181.

VII. THE MODE OF REDEMPTION OR EXTINCTION OF DUES BY PURCHASE.

When the question of redemption was debated, on April 23, the principal objection came from seigniors who thought that they would be injured if each proprietor were permitted to redeem or not as he chose. The well-to-do would redeem, the others would not. In this way the seigniors would be forced to be at expense in collecting without much to collect.

Several argued for the Savoy method—by communities.

Objection was later made to the rates. M. de Richier asked Tronchet:

"Does he think that in general dues in money (*rentes*) have been bought at the rate of twenty years' purchase? . . . As to dues in grain, I ask if in thirty years the redemption money will bring me as much as the grain dues. My conclusion is that the dues in money should be redeemed at twenty-five years' purchase and other dues at thirty."

Goupil de Prefelne made the same request. Populus argued that the rate remain as proposed.

Vicomte de Rochebrune said among other things that "differences exist which should affect the redemption rates. In the northern provinces, where there is a market for land, a property which brings annually 5,000 livres sells for only 100,000, while in Auvergne, where money is scarce, it sells for 200,000 livres. I propose that the committee take account of such differences."

Art. 21 adopted by a large majority.—*Moniteur*, IV. 190 f.

Report of the Feudal Committee upon the mode and rate of redemption of dues. Presented by Tronchet on March 28.

"The conditions under which the proprietor of a holding has granted it are indivisible, and joined together form the price of the grant. If reasons of public policy may permit an acquirer to redeem the dues and thus free his property from the burden with which the grantor has charged it, this can take place only by assuring the grantor a full indemnity for all the dues which he reserved, dues which are the more to be respected as they antedate the property of the acquirer. . . ."

"The dues which the grantor has reserved, if we except the *cens* and the *rentes* payable in money, share in all the character and advantages of the property of the acquirer, and so are susceptible of the same progressive increase in value as the property charged with them gains by the increase in the price of the produce. A capital figured on the basis of twenty years' purchase (au denier 20; i.e., annual income treated as five per cent.) of the existing annual product, would not therefore be a fair price for redemption. . . ."—Report, printed separately.

This is the reason why the rate for dues in kind is twenty-five years' purchase (au denier 25).

To determine the portion of the *lods et ventes* due at redemption of the other dues the Committee assumed that a high charge acted to retard transfers of property, while a low rate facilitated such transfers. The higher the charge, therefore, the lower should be the redemption rate; the lower the charge the higher the redemption rate. The committee divided the rates into seven classes, corresponding to seven supposed intervals of transfer, which in turn corresponded to seven existing charges or *lods et ventes* collected at transfers of property. The seven intervals from shortest to longest were 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, and 80 years. The general rate was twenty-five years' purchase. In the first case there would be 1/50 of a chance that the transfer would occur in any given year. If this were multiplied by 25, the rate in this case would be 1/2 of the existing charge. The others would be 5/11, 5/12, 5/13, 5/14, 5/15, and 5/16.—Abstract of committee's explanation.

Decree of 3-9 May, 1790:

"Art. 3. No proprietor of a fief or of a *censuel* holding shall be permitted to redeem separately the annual payments and dues with which the fief or the holding is charged, without redeeming at the same time the casual or occasional dues.—Duvergier, I, p. 163.

"Art. 21. The redemption of the sum at which shall be liquidated the annual product from the rights to annual and fixed dues shall be made as follows, namely: for the dues in money, and *corvées* and for the product of the monopolies, at 20 years' purchase, and for the dues in grain, poultry, food-stuffs, and fruits of the harvest, at 25 years' purchase."—Duvergier, I, p. 165.

Decree of 14-19 November, 1790:

"The National Assembly, considering that the provisions of Article 3, of the decree of 3 May, aimed only at safeguarding the legitimate rights of the former feudal proprietors, . . . and wishing to favor those who possess holdings which, under the old régime, were in feudal or *censuel* dependence on the national lands, formerly fiefs, decrees that those who possess holdings which depend, by feudal or *censuel* tenure, on the national lands, shall be permitted to redeem the occasional dues separately from the *cens*, and the annual fixed payments. . . ."—Duvergier, II, p. 20.

VIII. PEASANT OPINION UPON THE MODE AND RATES OF REDEMPTION.

Commune of Thuellins (Dauphiny), May 9, 1790:

Because of the decree which provides that the "valuation of the capital of the annual charges shall be ascertained on the basis of 25 times the annual product of the dues, these being ascertained by the average price of grain for ten years, when the price was excessive, not only is purchase impossible for the poorer proprietors, but it is so disadvantageous for all that those best off would not use the opportunity. . . . For the ten preceding years the average value of the local measure of 38 pounds of wheat was 4 livres, 4 sous, twenty-five times which would be 105 livres, apart from the occasional dues. But, in the enfranchisement in Savoy . . . the highest price for the same amount did not exceed 68 livres, including the occasional dues. . . . It is notorious that dues are almost always formed on the basis of 2 livres 5 sous, or 2 livres 10 sous, or, at most 2 livres 15 sous for each 38 pounds, including even the occasional dues."—Documents, No. 116.

Compare a similar computation in No. 119.

Citizens of Saint-Saturnin (Vaucluse), January 6, 1792:

" . . . There are domains for which one could purchase the fixed charges at 100 livres, while it would cost 1,200 livres to purchase the occasional dues. What proprietor would sacrifice 55 livres of income to free a property which he will never sell, neither he nor his heirs."—Documents, No. 128.

Remonstrances of the farmers and cultivators of the Haute-Marne, 8 May, 1790:

"The poor laborers and cultivators of the province of the Haute-Marne petition you most respectfully, saying that they hoped as citizens to have some small portion of that great regeneration of the kingdom whereby liberty is proclaimed through the decrees of the august Assembly. But these hopes of the petitioners will be but too disastrously without effect if the august Assembly does not extend to them a help-

ing hand, since they perceive that neither they nor theirs will ever enjoy that grand liberty but will continue eternally under the yoke of the feudal system where they have been held for centuries.

"It is true that by the decrees of the august Assembly, the petitioners are authorized to redeem (their feudal dues); but, however that may be, it is certain that they will be compelled in spite of themselves to remain in slavery without power to ransom themselves because the august Assembly has fixed the redemption of the payments assumed to be due the seigniors of fiefs at an extremely high rate, in holding produce dues at twenty-five years' purchase and other dues at twenty years' purchase. . . .

" . . . The petitioners therefore beg the august Assembly to have the charity to moderate not only the price fixed for payments in kind, but also that for the occasional dues for which the rate is too high. . . ."

—Documents, No. 115.

Address of the active citizens of the Commune of Puivert (Bouches-du-Rhône), . . . 20 January, 1792:

"We believed ourselves to be free, in our lands as in our persons after the decree which suppressed the feudal system; an experience of two years has proved to us that we are still slaves. We no longer have any seignior, he is at Coblenz; he has left us an agent and a bailiff who worry and disturb us as before the Revolution. The former (seignior) is no longer anything but our creditor, but he has exchanged his character of noble for that of inexorable prosecutor; if you do not come to our rescue, we are ruined.

"August representatives, we wish to free ourselves from feudal dues, but it is impossible for us to accomplish this if the decree is not modified. In order to extricate us from the claws of the feudal monster, deign to decree: 1. that obligations for *tasques* and *champarts* be redeemed separately from occasional dues of *lods*, which shall be redeemable when we shall have the means and the desire for accomplishing it."

—Documents, No. 130.

Petition of the active citizens . . . of the town of La Tour d'Aigues, . . . Bouches-du-Rhône, 29 March, 1792:

"Legislators, the abolition of the feudal system is, without doubt, the greatest benefit which the constitution has been able to extend to the country people; but from that Gothic stump shoots are sprouting again which will render this benefit illusory if we do not commend them to your capable hands for complete extirpation. . . .

"The Constituent Assembly had recognized the fact that the obligation to redeem simultaneously the dues on perpetual leases together with the right of transfer, was a burden on the buying and selling of land, because it exempted therefrom the lands held directly of the nation. Unless that exemption be extended to lands held on a feudal tenure the majority of landholders, who are accustomed to keep their domains in their families for centuries, will not be willing to pay for a right of *lods* which they know will mean to them nothing but a substantial loss; they will find themselves perpetually subjected to the payment

of *cens* and exposed to the vexation of continual discussions with the former seignior or his agent regarding the quality of the grain which they bring annually to discharge that same *cens*. Separate redemption avoids all these disadvantages. . . .

"Accordingly, we petition you 1. To grant to the country people, who are subject to the feudal system, the right to redeem annual and fixed dues, such as *cens*, *tasques*, harvest dues, and others separately from the occasional dues for *lods* which shall be redeemable when they sell their holdings or when they have the means. . . ."—Documents, No. 135.

IX. HOW A PEASANT PROPRIETOR MAY PROVE A FEUDAL DUE ILLEGITIMATE.

"Interpretation of the decree of 15 March last, regarding the payment of dues. 17 October, 1790.

"On a report made to the Feudal Committee of a memorial expressed in these terms:

"A tenant refuses payment to his former seignior of the dues which he owes him.

"It is said, in article 2 of title III of the decree of the 15 March, 1790, that *failing proof to the contrary*, seigniorial dues are assumed to be the price of an original grant of land.

"According to this, is not the citizen seignior exempted from all proofs, even from the production of his title-deeds, and does it not rest with the tenant to prove that he owes nothing?"

"The Feudal Committee holds that, according to the letter and the spirit of article 2, title III, of the decree of 15 March, 1790, the former seignior, who is in good and longstanding possession of the right to collect certain dues on a piece of land, has no need of any title or of any special document for justifying the lawfulness of those dues.

"But that, according to the same decree, the tenant, even though he has been accustomed for centuries to discharge that obligation, may undertake to prove its illegitimacy.

"That, in order to establish that proof, he may employ all the means which the principles of the case and even of the ancient jurisprudence place at his disposal.

"That one of these means is the examination of all the title-deeds of the seignior, examination which, it has always been held, could not be refused, for the very simple reason that all the title-deeds relating to a jurisdiction or to a right of feudal superiority are considered to be common to seignior and vassal.

"In two words, that the seignior need not, in truth, produce his titles in order to establish his proof positive, since he has possession on his side; but that the tenant may force him to produce them in order to establish or maintain his proof negative."—Goupil; Merlin, Secretary. Documents, No. 332.

X. DIFFICULTIES OF ENFORCING THE LAW.

Procureurs généraux syndics of Dauphiny, January 6, 1790:

"Some have forcibly taken possession of ovens and mills. . . . The fear of violence, which the people

permits itself in these moments of excitement, prevents the possessors of feudal rights from recurring to the authority of the tribunals. . . . It thereby becomes impossible for the majority to pay their taxes. The diminution, and even for some the total loss of their revenue, do not permit them to make the declarations demanded for the patriotic contribution."—Documents, No. 34.

Complaints of a seignior of Montaut (Gers), 1790:

"On all Saints, when *rentes* are paid, one Joseph Roucau, alias Labande, a mason, cried out at the foot of the church steps that the tenants of Montaut were forbidden to pay any sort of due to the seignior on pain of being burned out. . . . Only three have dared to pay. . . .

"The inhabitants of Montaut have taken steps to make common cause with those of my other estates to stop all payments. . . .

"What can one hope from the municipalities? . . . Who wishes to be exposed to be rebuffed by a cobbler? . . . They are our *rentiers*, and consequently interested in the prevention of payments. . . . What would the National Assembly say to the Sieur Dupouy, Mayor of Montaut, asked why he has not paid the accustomed dues? . . . 'I have been afraid of being burned out.' That is what he said to me. . . ."

—Documents, No. 176.

Comte de Brancion, March 28, 1790:

" . . . The inhabitants of Royaumeix, near Toul, of which I was formerly seignior in part, firmly believe that the intention of the National Assembly is that they pay no *rentes* or *cens*, even those due for the year 1789, and that it is permitted them to kill with guns . . . all sorts of pigeons belonging to the former seigniors. . . . Indeed, a single inhabitant has arrogated to himself the right . . . to shoot, in front of my sisters and my nephews, and in the village, the greatest part of my pigeons. . . . This man is a municipal officer."—Documents, No. 21.

Municipality of Luplanté (Eure et Loire), May 8, 1790:

" . . . All the vassals are surprised to find that they must pay at the next harvest these *champarts* with all their odious characteristics; for example, hunting up the *champarteur* to count the sheaves and to carry the sheaves belonging to him to his barn, before taking anything for themselves, however long it takes. . . ."

—Documents, No. 160.

A communal decree annulled July 11, 1790:

The King in Council being informed "of the deliberation taken May 30 of the present year by the municipality of Marsangis . . . to the effect of summoning proprietors to deposit at the clerk's office within fifteen days the titles by virtue of which they pretend to collect the rights of *cens*, *champarts*, etc., . . . in default of which payment of the said rights should be refused . . . the report heard, the King being in his Council has quashed and annulled, quashes and annuls the deliberation taken in communal council by the municipality of Marsangis. . . . In consequence, all proprietors (in this case peasants) . . . shall be held to continue until purchase the payment

of the former seigniorial dues . . . save that the interested parties may resort to the courts having jurisdiction in such cases. . . ."—Documents, No. 167.

Note.—The directory of the department declined to publish this decree. See Documents, p. 378.

Grievances of Amiot of Treilles, near Chateau-Landon, 16 July, 1790:

"Mr. President: Permit me to place before your eyes the sad and most cruel state of anarchy, in which we live in the part of Gâtinais where I dwell.

"If all citizens have the right to demand justice and the protection of the laws, tell me, I beg, the means for securing that protection, so that I may not be continually exposed to death from hunger and suffering, or to a death by violence in the defense of one's property, of the laws, and of the decrees of the National Assembly. . . .

"Our collectors of harvest dues are threatened if they appear in the fields; we ourselves are compelled to appear only in force and armed for our personal safety,—consider the cruel situation in which we find ourselves in Gâtinais.

"I have applied, sir, to the municipalities for the execution of the decrees; they, being composed entirely of persons who owe harvest dues, have sent me away.

"I have applied to the courts in the hope of being more fortunate; at Nemours, the audience of two hundred inhabitants so intimidated the judges that they would not pronounce sentence. The ushers were maltreated and threatened until they refused to go forth.

"The inadequacy of the national guards left no remedy for this inconvenience. Thus, without laws, since they cannot be executed, without justice, since it is refused us, without any hope of compelling respect for the decrees; the outrages on property are of daily occurrence, crimes go unpunished, and from this (follows) fermentation and trouble, disorder and the crime of disobedience to the laws and rebellion against the king's orders.

"I beseech you, Mr. President, bring this frightful picture before the eyes of the National Assembly, check the disorders which, if they persist, will be all the more injurious to the execution of your decrees, and to the public peace. . . ."—Documents, No. 170.

Complaints of the Directory of the Department of Lot, September 22, 1790:

" . . . gallows are erected for those who will pay the dues and for those who will collect them. . . . What most afflicts us is that in several places municipal officers are either the secret promoters or the accomplices or the indifferent witnesses of the disturbances. . . . But, what is to be expected of bodies so weak, so ignorant, so little disposed to submit every private interest to the public interest. . . ."—Documents, No. 290.

Attitude of some in 1792:—

Sieur Laurent, of Bordeaux, March 15, 1792:

" . . . Feudalism, far from being destroyed, has been consecrated by the Constituent Assembly. Moreover, its decree is enforced nowhere; everywhere the citizens demand the seignior's original titles. . . . The

majority of the towns regret their privileges; almost all the bourgeois have embraced the cause of the nobles, or that of the priests; on your side are scarcely any others than the farmer, and if you have him still, the reason is that he hopes never again to be forced to pay the *rente* and other seigniorial obligations. If you force him to do it, all is lost. What do I say? Force him to do it? It is impossible, for here are two, three, or four years' arrears, and who are those able to pay the arrearages now due and those which will be added? . . ."—Documents, No. 133.

From *Deux Amis de Liberté*, IV, pp. 277-279. A contemporary history of the Revolution.

After a severe arraignment of the system of feudalism the writers say:

"Wherever the Assembly saw the consequence of a voluntary agreement it assumed that the obligations were lawful, and scrupulously substituted for the dues a sum in redemption in proportion to them. Wherever it saw only the abuse of force and usurpations due to pride it condemned them pitilessly, suppressing them without compensation. . . .

"The Assembly did not even show too much rigor in exacting proofs of the validity of a right, persuaded that often property incontestably sanctioned by the rule of usage and by public opinion is very difficult to support by documentary evidence, which a thousand accidents may destroy. Accordingly, it believed that it could admit in their place titles of a secondary order, which would sufficiently guarantee the validity of the due in question. Finally the Assembly converted all feudal dues into rents extinguishable by purchase. In regard to the rate of redemption, one may say that it employed every means which prudence and a sense of justice would suggest for the common advantage of both parties. If there was any advantage conceded it was certainly in favor of the proprietor."

(The word proprietor in the context appears to refer to the peasant holder of the property rather than to the seignior.)

QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS.

1. What was the object of the riotous acts on the estate of the Comte de Germiny? Did similar incidents occur in Russia in 1905 or 1917?
2. Does the standing of the Vicomte de Noailles and that of the Duc d'Aiguillon affect in any way the force of their suggestions?
3. Is the statement of the Duc d'Aiguillon about the conduct of feudal agents true?
4. In the August decree, what indicates its character as a promise or a program?
5. Did the direction of Merlin's thought seem to change between his September and his February reports?
6. Why should theories upon the origin of feudal dues, current in 1789 and 1790, be taken into the account, although these theories may be historically unsound?
7. Does the Abbé Tardieu's statement differ from

that of Lowell, *Eve of the French Revolution*, pages 196-197?

8. Compare Trippier's argument that the nobles, instead of being compensated, should make restitution to the people, with the present declaration of radicals in favor of an extraordinary tax on capital.

9. Which of the various theories comes nearest to our conceptions of the origin of feudal relationships?

10. Can the explanations of the Intermediary Commission of Lorraine be regarded as free from the suggestions of self-interest?

11. What is the weak spot in the argument of the villagers of Prâlon?

12. Was the accusation against the courts made in the petition of the *Sieur Roncey* just?

13. What fundamental assumption underlies the argument of Merlin in his February report? Is his argument spoiled by the consideration that many instances of servile tenure did not have the origin he indicated?

14. What was the theory of the opponents of Merlin in the debate of February 27? Were their statements more exact than his upon the origin of these tenures?

15. What dues did the Baron de Marguerittes probably have in mind? Was his argument akin to that now made on the basis of the fact that widows and orphans hold stock in some forms of business which radicals desire to destroy or control?

16. Is there any analogy between the implications of Article I of the law of March 15 and the doctrine of the early American Abolitionists?

17. What fundamental change in the social importance of the seignior is made by Title II?

18. In whose favor were the provisions of Title III? Was this decision wise or unwise, straightforward or the consequence of bourgeois and seigniorial influence?

19. Why was it hard to determine fairly what should be paid in lieu of annual dues?

20. Did the rates finally adopted represent a decision favorable to the lord or to the peasant, judging from the course of the discussion?

21. Was it justifiable to insist upon the payment at the same time of a price for the occasional dues (*lods et ventes*)?

22. What was the force of the peasant argument upon the rates of redemption? Upon the necessity of redeeming annual and occasional dues at the same time?

23. What analogy is there between the conduct of the peasants in 1790 and that of the Bolsheviks, Spartacans, and Communists of 1919?

24. Why were the seigniors apparently so helpless? Is the case of the capitalists at the present time similar?

25. Express a critical opinion of the work of the Constituent Assembly in attempting to sweep away the remnants of feudalism.

26. Write an account of the abolition of feudalism in 1789 and 1790 on the basis of the foregoing documents.

For Colleges, Teachers' Training Courses and High School Classes

The study of the antecedents, the events and the outcome of the Great War is as important today as a year ago. Teachers especially must be trained to see the War in all its aspects.

For an understanding of the background of the War; for an analysis of its immediate causes; for the principal documents relating to the War, see

Collected Materials for the Study of the War

By ALBERT E. MCKINLEY

Revised and enlarged edition, 220 pages. Price, 80 cents net

Contains the full text of the most important war legislation of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

MCKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

Goode's Base Maps and Graphs

Prepared by J. PAUL GOODE, Professor of Geography in the University of Chicago

Maps for all classes of work in applied sciences and the various fields of research. Adapted for use in every grade from the common school to the university, in a wide variety of courses.

Printed on a special grade of paper, with the best ink, and with presswork of the highest order.

All maps perforated for insertion in a standard notebook cover with page 8 x 10½ inches. The large maps fold into this cover.

Maps shown in blackface type made by the photo-lithographic process. Others printed from zinc plates.

SERIES I	SERIES II	SERIES III	SERIES IV	MAPS
8x10½ inches 1 cent each Map No.	15x10½ inches 3 cents each *20½x10½ inches *4 cents each Map No.	21x15 inches 5 cents each Map No.	48x36 inches 40 cents each Map No.	
1	101	The World: on Mercator's projection.
..	*101He	The World (continents): Homalographic projection.
..	*101Ho	The World (oceans): Homalographic projection.
..	*101H3	...	301H3	The World (continents): Homalographic projection.
..	*101S	The World (continents): Sinusoidal projection.
..	*101P	The World in Polar Hemispheres: Lambert's azimuthal, equal-area projection.
..	...	201PB	...	Map as 101P showing Isobars for January and July.
2	102	North America: on Lambert's azimuthal projection.
3	103	South America: Sanson's projection.
4	104	Europe: conic projection.
5	105	Asia: Lambert's equal-area projection.
6	106	Africa: Sanson's projection.
7	107	Australasia: Mercator's projection.
9	309	United States of America: conic projection.
10	110	United States of America: state outlines only: conic projection.
..	111	Canada.
..	112	Mexico.
14	114	The British Isles: conic projection.
16	116	216	...	Europe, Western and Southern: conic projection.
17	117	France: conic projection.
18	118	The Spanish Peninsula: conic projection.
19	119	Italy: conic projection.
20	Central Europe: conic projection.
21	121	The German Empire: conic projection.
24	124	The Levant: conic projection.
..	132	232	...	United States of America, by counties with names: polyconic projection.
..	133	Chicago and vicinity.
80	Climatic Chart (yearly).
..	181	Monthly Weather Chart.

GRAPHS

TEAR THIS PRICE LIST OUT AND USE IT FOR FUTURE REFERENCE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO : 5845 ELLIS AVENUE : ILLINOIS

NEW HISTORY MAPS

"A priori guaranteed to the teaching world, as well as to the world of scholarship, as standing among the best that can be made."

Michigan Historical Commission

A STATE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ARCHIVES

COMMISSIONERS:

ALBERT E. SLEEPER,
GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN.
CLARENCE M. BURTON, M.A., DETROIT,
PRESIDENT.
WILLIAM L. JENES, M.A., PORT HURON,
VICE-PRESIDENT.
ST. REV. MGR. FRANK A. O'BRIEN, LL.D., KALAMAZOO.
WILLIAM L. CLEMENTS, B.S., BAY CITY.
AUGUSTUS C. CARTON, EAST TAWAR.
CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE, PH.D., ANN ARBOR.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS:

GEORGE N. FULLER, PH.D., SECRETARY AND EDITOR.
FLOYD S. STREETER, M.A., ARCHIVIST.
MARE S. FERRY, CURATOR.
NETTIE S. ANDRUS, CHIEF CLERK.

Denoyer-Geppert Co.,
School Map Publishers,
460 E. Ohio St.,
Chicago, Illinois.

December
Sixteen
1918

Gentlemen:

Our office received this morning a visit from your Mr. Walker. His courtesy, intelligence and vigor in presenting the maps won us, as did also the maps. We shall be pleased to say a good word in Michigan for this highly commendable collection. Indeed, any work put out by Professors Breasted, Harding and Hart would be a priori guaranteed to the teaching world as well as the world of scholarship as standing among the best that can be made.

Very respectfully yours.

GNF/NA

The State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan.

For additional particulars fill in, cut out and mail the coupon

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY,

(H-O-11-19)

School Map Publishers, in touch with the scholars of the world

460 East Ohio Street, Chicago

I am interested in the items checked:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Breasted Ancient History Maps | <input type="checkbox"/> D-G Geography Maps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Harding European History Maps | <input type="checkbox"/> Philips' Commercial and Industrial Geography Maps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hart American History Maps | <input type="checkbox"/> Desk and Wall Outline Maps |

Name _____

School _____

Address _____

Sales representatives wanted. School men preferred. Please write.